National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. • WITHOUT CONCEALMENT....WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 51. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1853. WHOLE NO. 675.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Selections.

THE TRACT SOCIETY.

LETTER FROM HON. WILLIAM JAY.

NEW YORK, Monday, Feb 14, 1853.

To Rev. R. S. Cook, Cor. Sec'y American Tract Society.

REVEREND SIR: I have been favoured with your letter of the last month setting forth the pecuniary exigencies of the American Tract Society, and suggesting to my "charitable consideration" a donation to its funds. Few persons hailed with more satisfaction than myself the establishment of your Society, or more cordially approved the truly Catholic principles on which it was founded. I long since became one of its Life Directors, and have frequently contributed to its funds. The professed object of the Society was to inculcate Christian faith and practice, and to a very great extent it has been faithful to its profession, and I doubt not that it has been largely instrumental in promoting the spiritual welfare of multitudes.

But the good effected by human agency is seldom without alloy, and for some years painful doubts have intruded themselves on my mind as to the propriety of the course pursued by the Society in regard to a most momentous subject. Against these doubts I have long struggled, and at times with success. But they have again and again returned with increased force, and they have been so entirely confirmed by some recent developments, that I am constrained to return a most reluctant denial to the application in your letter. I am well aware of the deep responsibility I assume in placing any obstacle, however slight, in the way of the Society. Of this responsibility, the pain I may give valued friends and the obloquy I may draw upon myself from a very minor portion—I feel the infinitely greater weight of my responsibility to my Maker for withholding my aid from an agency that has effected so much for his glory and the good of man. This responsibility I have anxiously pondered, and have come to the conviction that I may not avoid it. The facts and reasons which have produced this conviction I will proceed to state. Should they be found insufficient to justify me, they will tend to save others from the error into which I have fallen; and should they, on the other hand, be found valid, they may lead to salutary results.

The classification of sins into those of commission and omission is trite. All Scripture testifies that mere inaction has often incurred the divine wrath. The Jewish priests, although sedulous in the routine of ceremonial duties, were denounced, in the indignant language of inspiration, as "dumb dogs," because they omitted to rebuke popular sins. In the account of the last judgment, those who are to "go away into everlasting punishment" are not condemned as heretics, nor as the perpetrators of crime, but as guilty of having *omitted* to administer to the necessities of Christ's afflicted and oppressed brethren.

You have by this time, Sir, anticipated that my charge against the Society is one of OMISSION. There is a giant and, in its influence, an all-pervading sin in our land—a sin which is destroying the peace and happiness of millions, both for the life that is and for that which is to come; and which is hardening the hearts and paralyzing the consciences of many more by its reflective consequences. Yet the American Tract Society has publicly and officially announced through you, as its organ, that it does not intend to recognise even the existence of this sin!

About a year since the ministers and delegates of the Congregational Union of Fox River, Illinois, addressed a very Christian letter to the Society. In this letter they very forcibly remark: "We feel 'sure that the time has come when the continued 'absence from the publications of your Society of all 'that relates to Slavery will be significant; that 'silence can no longer be neutrality or indifference; 'and that a tract literature which speaks less plainly 'of Slavery than of other specific evils will conduce 'to a defective, partial and unsound morality."

In your official reply of 27th Feb., 1852, without letting a word escape your pen acknowledging the sinfulness of American Slavery, you urge various reasons for not breaking the silence so long observed by the Society respecting human bondage. "It 'would seem a sacrifice of a greater to a lesser good, 'to engage in the discussion of a topic already ex'hausted, with the likelihood of satisfying none, and 'with the certainty of alienating multitudes of our 'best friends," &c. Your publications, we are informed, must be of a character "calculated to meet 'the approbation *of all evangelical Christians*;" and you seem to think that, amid the Anti-Slavery agitation, it is desirable "that *at least one* institution 'should move forward on the simple errand that 'brought the Saviour into the world—proclaiming 'Christ and him crucified," &c.; and you aver 'that on no subject, probably, are evangelical Chris'tians more at variance" than Slavery; and you 'conclude with declaring that "the course of duty 'seems plain before us to *adhere* as a society to the 'simple Gospel in its essential saving truths." The Union were not convinced by your arguments; on the contrary, they resolved that ere long no Catholic Society of Publication can well refuse to express Anti-Slavery truth in some of its various forms of moral or biblical argument, fact or sentiment; and to hasten this desired consummation, they ordered the correspondence to be made public.

I am unable to reconcile the position assumed in your letter with the past action of the Society, or with the usually received ideas of Christian obligation. It seems your tracts must meet the approbation of *all evangelical* Christians. If we ask who these are, we shall be told, such as agree in maintaining the Scriptural authority of certain abstract doctrines. But we all know, that these same Christians differ widely on various questions of moral practice. You are not ignorant that evangelical wine and rumsellers, and drinkers, abound both in town and country; and yet your Society is lavish of its censures on them. It condemns the theatre and race-course, although not a few believers in the evangelical creed frequent both. You issue publications against dancing, and yet how many sons and daughters mingle in the waltz, in the presence and with the consent of their evangelical parents? You condemn travelling on the Sabbath, yet our Sunday steamboats and rail-cars are not without their evangelical passengers. You do not hesitate to rebuke gambling, yet evangelicals may be found at the card and the billiard-table. As far as I can judge, the publications of your Society have been in accordance with the rule you announce on few subjects, except that of human bondage and its attendant atrocities. I know not that in the twenty-seven years of its existence the Society has published a line intended to touch the conscience of an American slave-breeder or trader. On the contrary, especial care has been taken to EXPUNGE from your reprints every expression that could even imply a censure on our stupendous national iniquity. The Society has no hesitation in condemning cruelty, oppression and injustice, but it shrinks with affright at the very idea of acknowledging that it is cruel, oppressive and unjust to reduce a *black* man to the condition of a beast of burden, to deny him legal marriage, and to sell him and his children to the highest bidder, in company with the beasts of the field. This extreme sensitiveness is shown in the alteration of a passage in your reprint of Gurney's essay on the habitual exercise of love to God. Gurney says: "If 'this love had always prevailed among professing 'Christians, where would have been the sword of 'the crusader? Where the African slave trade? 'Where the odious system which permits to man a 'property in his fellow men, and converts rational 'beings into marketable chattels?" (Page 142.) This was meat too strong for the digestion of the Society, and hence it was carefully diluted, so that it might be swallowed without producing the slightest nausea, as follows: "If this love had always 'prevailed among professing Christians, where would 'have been the sword of the crusader? *Where the 'tortures of the Inquisition?* Where every system of 'oppression and wrong by which he who has the 'power revels in luxury and ease at the expense of 'his fellow-men?" (Page 199.) It was an ingenious thought to turn upon the *Inquisition* Gurney's application of his subject to slave traders and holders, and to lose sight of *property in man*, in indefinite generalities.

Your last report, in announcing the reprint of the memoir of Mary Lundie Duncan, tells us: "A few 'pages which the Committee deemed of less interest 'to the general reader, or which alluded to *points of 'disagreement among evangelical Christians*, have 'been dropped." The *pages* dropped are indeed few and unimportant, and seemed to have been dropped for the purpose of justifying the word "abridged" on the title-page. But the *passages* dropped are very significant. In her diary for March 22, 1833, the following passage is *expunged* in the Society's edition, while every other word on the page is retained: "We have been lately much interested in 'the emancipation of slaves. I never heard elo'quence more overpowering than that of George 'Thompson. I am most thankful that he has been 'raised up. O that the measure soon to be proposed 'in Parliament may be effectual."

Poor Mary! The American Tract Society will not allow you to breathe a wish for West India emancipation by act of Parliament, nor to admire the eloquence of an Anti-Slavery lecturer. The biographer of this lovely and highly gifted saint remarks: "When George Thompson, the eloquent pleader for 'the Abolition of Slavery, was called to visit the 'United States in the hope that his remarkable 'power of influencing the public mind might be 'beneficial there, we find the youthful philanthropist 'whose ardent mind glowed with exalted sympa'thies, and felt an interest in loftier occupations 'than usually kindle the enthusiasm of girls of her 'age, embodying her desires for his success, in the 'following verses." This paragraph and the lines they introduced are both EXPUNGED from your edition. A Broadway bookseller had already published an *unmutilated* copy of the book, but this religious Society, more sensitive than even *New York* traffic to the good will of the slaveholders, suppressed not merely the Anti-Slavery poetry, but the testimony of a mother to the philanthropic sentiments of her departed daughter! But the work of expurgation did not stop here. In Mary's diary is the following entry: "August 1; Freedom has dawned this morning on the British Colonies. (*No more degraded lower than the brutes—no more bowed down with suffering from which there is no redress.*) the sons of Africa have obtained the rights of fellow subjects—the rights of man, the immortal creation of God. (*Now they may seek the sanctuary fearless of the lash—they may call their children their own.*) Hope will animate their hearts and give vigour to their efforts. Oh, for more holy men to show them the way of salvation! The Lord keep them from riot and idleness. They have been so little taught that He only can avert confusion and tumult as the result of their joy. Some Christians there are among their number, who will influence others. My poor fellow-travellers through life's short wilderness, may I meet with many of you in Heaven, where even I can hope to dwell through the love of my risen Lord! There none will despise the negro whom Jesus Christ hath pitied and redeemed."

The passages in italics and in brackets are *expunged* in the Society's edition. Mary is permitted to announce that the negroes have become British subjects, to express her apprehensions of riot and idleness, confusion and tumult as consequences of emancipation, and to indulge the hope of meeting negroes in Heaven, where they will not be despised. But she is not permitted to allude to the cruelties and abominations to which these same negroes had been subjected. The expunged passages involve no doctrinal "points of disagreement among evangelical Christians." Why, then, were they stricken out? Because the same cruelties and enormities to which she alluded are perpetrated at home by evangelical Christians who belong to and support the American Tract Society.

The Society will not venture the denial of the *truth* of the expunged assertions. It would surely not aver that American slave children *do* belong to their parents. It would be put to confusion by the solemn judicial affirmance of the validity of a bequest of a mother to one person, and of her *unborn* children to another. It would be confuted by the sale of children at auction, and in particular of a sale reported within the few last days, of a child three years old bringing $300 under the hammer, while a Southern paper adverts with pride to the high price of human flesh, as evidence of "our agricultural prosperity." Your Society, Sir, expunged Mary's assertions, not because they were untrue, but because they are now as true here as they were in the West Indies, and it is the policy of the Society to cover up and conceal whatever reflects odium on the "peculiar institution."

Your Committee tell us in their last Report that they "have never lost sight of their responsibilities 'to those of tender years;" and it seems they issue the *Child's Paper*, of which great numbers are circulated. Yet the responsibilities to children resting on the Committee permit them to expunge an expression likely to remind us that there are hundreds of thousands of children in our land who are mere articles of merchandise. These very responsibilities are, it seems, perfectly compatible with entire silence respecting the ignorance and degradation of this great multitude "of tender years." The Committee know that in some of our States even a free mother, if her complexion be dark, is, by law, liable to be scourged on her bare back should she be caught teaching her little ones to read your *Child's Paper*, yet not a word of remonstrance escapes the American Tract Society! In the very last number of the *Child's Paper* I read that "there are between 10,000 and 12,000 children in the City of 'New York, who never enter a church or school,' and who 'cannot read the Bible.' . . . . Here are heathen at 'home;' what is cared for them? . . . . These children 'must be cared for.'" Indeed! And is it nothing to your Society that there are in our country about HALF A MILLION of little black heathen who are prevented by law from reading the Bible? These little heathen have souls as imperishable, destinies as momentous as the white heathen in New York. Must this half million be cared for? Ah! that is a "point of disagreement among Evangelical Christians," and hence the Society must not even recognise the existence of children who do not belong to their parents.

Permit me now to ask your attention to the very different course pursued by the Society in regard to the traffic in the bones and sinews, the mind and soul of immortal MAN, and the traffic in intoxicating drinks. Between 20 and 30 of your tracts are devoted to the subject of intemperance in all its relations. It is curious to observe the desire of your writers to avail themselves of the arguments and illustrations furnished by Slavery, and at the same time their extreme caution in avoiding all reference to *American* Slavery. Where even by implication, censure is cast on human bondage, it is human bondage in *other* countries than our own. In Tract No. 300, to the excuse of the distiller, that he cannot sacrifice his property, conscience is made to answer: "Suppose you were now in *Brazil* and the owner of 'a large establishment to fit out slave-traders with 'hand-cuffs for the coast of *Africa*, and could not 'change your business without considerable pecunia'ry sacrifice, would you make the sacrifice, or would 'you keep your fires and hammers going." In remonstrating against the cruelty of the traffic in rum, it is remarked: "If a man lives only to make a de'scent on the peaceful abodes of *Africa* and to tear 'parents away from their weeping children, and hus'bands from their wives and homes, where is the 'man that will deem this a moral business?" "Other men will prey on unoffending *Africa* and 'bear human sinews across the ocean to be sold. 'Have you a right to do it?" (No. 305.) Once more, speaking of the duty of rescuing the drunkard, it is asked: "What would you not do to pull a neigh'bour out of the water, or out of the fire, or to deliver 'him from *Algerine* captivity?" (No. 422.) So it seems the Society is at liberty to hold up as cruel and immoral the traffic in human flesh in Africa, Brazil, and Algiers, but not in *our own land*—that being a "point of disagreement among Evangelical Christians."

And now, Sir, I ask you, on what evangelical principle does the Society condemn the *foreign* slave trade? Is it because an act of Congress forbids it? The Society has not yet, I believe, like some of its patrons, elevated the lower above the higher law, and made the national statute book the standard of right and wrong. Nor, indeed, can the advocates of the supremacy of the lower law maintain, that an act of Congress can render immoral the conduct of Africans, Algerines and Brazilians, when that conduct is in conformity with the laws of their respective countries. Is it, then, in reference to the higher law, the will of God revealed in his blessed Gospel, that the *foreign* traffic is condemned? If so, then I ask to what divine precept is it opposed? Buying and selling and the exchange of commodities is essential to human society, and is nowhere condemned in God's word. Why then, Sir, I ask in all seriousness, is it more immoral for an African to sell, or a Brazilian to buy men and women, than apes and parrots? Is it because men and women are not by the higher law subjects of commerce? Before you reply in the affirmative, remember that our laws, framed for the most part by evangelical Christians, expressly declare vast multitudes of men and women to be mere chattels, vendible articles. Said Henry Clay, on the floor of the Senate, vindicating property in man, "that is property which the law makes property." Now, every slave sold in Africa to a Brazilian merchant, is property by the African law, and is granted, bargained, sold, and delivered by a title as valid as that ever received by Mr. Clay to one of his slaves. Again, then, I ask, why is the sale and purchase of a man in Africa, most undoubtedly a heinous crime, while the immorality of the sale and purchase in Virginia of a fellow-countryman and perhaps a fellow-Christian, is such an abstruse question, that the American Tract Society will not venture to approach its discussion? Can it be that your Society is silent on this traffic, because it is sanctioned by human law? This can hardly be, since the Society is unsparing in its denunciations of the traffic in rum, notwithstanding the powers that be, ordained as they are of God, have taken the traffic under their peculiar guardianship. Very irreverently does your tract speak of

"Stale debauch forth issuing from the sties
That LAW has licensed." (No. 240.)

You are silent on Slavery because, as you say, on no other subject probably "are evangelical Chris'tians more at variance." I think, Sir, you greatly overrate the evangelical patrons and advocates of Slavery. I doubt whether you can find one hundred evangelical Christians out of the slave States, unconnected in any way with Slavery, slaveholders, and cotton, who will publicly avow that American Slavery is a righteous institution, and the slave code in accordance with the spirit and precepts of the Gospel of Christ. Surely, surely, sir, I should make a most extravagant and reckless estimate were I to compute the evangelical champions of slave-breeding, slave-trading, and slave-catching, at a tythe of the evangelicals who in their practice repudiate total abstinence from intoxicating drinks. Nevertheless, on this last "point of evangelical disagreement," the society expresses itself without fear and without reserve.

But some of our friends, you may say, insist that the Bible sanctions Slavery, and what can we do? And some of your friends also insist that the Bible sanctions moderate drinking and the *sale* of intoxicating drinks, and what *do* you do? Why you tell us "the great laws of morals are indeed unchanged, 'but the degrees of light and knowledge which men 'possess may be very different. We should not deem 'it right to apply our laws and knowledge in judg'ing of the laws of Sparta which authorized theft—'nor our views of the marriage relation, to condemn 'the conduct of Abraham, David and Jacob. Man's 'conduct is to be estimated by the light he has." To the plea that the Bible does not prohibit the traffic, it is answered, "Where is there a formal prohibition of piracy, or bigamy, or kidnapping, or suicide, or duelling, or the sale of obscene books and paintings? . . . The truth is, that the Bible has lain down great principles of conduct, which on all these subjects could be easily applied, which are applied, and which under the guidance of equal honesty may be as easily applied to the subject of which I am speaking." (No. 305.)

To assail Slavery is to assail its supporters, and you think that the Society by discussing the subject would alienate multitudes of its best friends. Similar delicacy, or, if you please, prudence, has not been observed towards the advocates of moderate drinking. "Our next opposition is from a band clothed in *white*—professors of our holy religion—enlisted soldiers of the CHURCH, engaged to every good work of benevolence: they come to intercede for the MONSTER (moderate drinking), and oppose our enterprise. What can be the meaning of this? O, where lies this astonishing witchery? What has put the CHURCH TO SLEEP? What has made her *angry* at the call to come forth from the embrace of her deadliest foe?" (No. 240.) Were the inquiry made, what witchery has made the CHURCH blind, and deaf and dumb, in regard to the groans and sufferings of millions on our soil denied the Word of God, and forcibly kept in ignorance and degradation? the true answer would be, I am persuaded, "the neutrality of the American Tract Society, and the vast number of the Clergy, to whom the fear of man has proved a snare."

Very strange is it that while the Society will not even hint dislike to Slavery, it brings against the traffic in rum an array of arguments equally effective and valid against the traffic in men, women and children. Thus you urge the duty of doing as you would be done by, and the remorse we shall feel at death for the suffering we have inflicted, and the great command to love our neighbour (No. 242)—our responsibility to God for the results of our own selfishness (No 300)—the waste of human happiness (No. 240)—that the traffic "tears asunder the 'strongest bonds of society, it severs the tenderest ties of nature" (No. 249). To the plea of the rum-seller that his trade is his livelihood, it is answered, "beg, dig, do anything but this. It would be a glo'rious martyrdom to *starve*, contrasted with obtain'ing a livelihood by such an employment" (No. '305). "Where have you derived authority to pro'cure a living at a sacrifice of conscience, character 'and the dearest interests of others?" (No 239.)

The Society shrinks from the opposition it would encounter from slaveholders. In your letter already quoted, you vindicate "the *peaceful* course pursued 'by the Society," and you say "when there shall be '*unity of sentiment*, and a treatise of standard value 'shall be written, such as the Committee can approve, '*then* there will be propriety in claiming that a 'Tract press shall engage in this branch of moral 'discussion." Unless I mistake your meaning, there is here an implied promise, that when all evangelical Christians are united in condemning Slavery, both in theory and practice, and when of course the Monster is at his last gasp, and there is no use in striking another blow, *then* the Society will attack him, provided the Committee shall cordially agree as to the weapon to be used. In the meantime, while the monster is in full vigour and extending his ravages, you think it best, "that at least *one* institution should 'move forward on the simple errand that brought 'the Saviour into the world—proclaiming Christ and 'him crucified," &c. Happy is it, Sir, that this desire for peace, this longing to proclaim Christ and him crucified, without heeding popular and prevailing sins, was not felt by the Society till *after* it had done battle against gamblers, dancers, theatre-goers, Sabbath-breakers, moderate-drinkers, and rum-sellers. Your tracts against intemperance display anything but a non-resistant spirit. For example—"The demon will daunt the timid. It is noisy and 'fiery; attack it, and it will roll its eyes and 'snap its teeth, and threaten vengeance. Attempt 'to starve it, and it will rage like the famished 'tiger. Thousands have fed it against their con'sciences rather than meet its fury. *But fear not.* 'Be firm—be decided—be courageous, connect your 'cause with Heaven. It is the cause of God, the 'cause for which Immanuel did. *Let the demon no 'longer hide in the sanctuary.* Expel forever the ac'cursed enemy, that the Lord may bless us with life 'and peace." (No. 240.)

Possibly the Society has deemed it its duty to cooperate with Union Saving Committees and Baltimore politicians, and Cotton Merchants, in their patriotic efforts to suppress all discussion, of the "delicate subject;" a discussion having such disturbing influences on northern trade and politics. Yet such a supposition cannot be allowed, after the noble testimony borne by the Society to the right and benefit of free discussion. "There are some great principles 'in regard to our country which are settled and 'which are never to be violated so long as our liber'ties are safe. Among them are these: that every 'subject may be subjected to candid and *most free 'discussion*; that public opinion, enlightened and 'correct, may be turned against any course of evil 'conduct; that public opinion is, under God, the prime 'source of security to our laws and morals, that men 'may be induced by *ample discussion* and by the 'voice of conscience and of reason, to abandon any 'course that is erroneous." (No. 305.) Such are the rights and benefits of discussion when directed against the *seller of Rum*; do they lose all their virtue when directed against the seller of human flesh?

Perhaps your Society revolts at the idea of descending into the arena of politics; but if so, how are we to understand the following exhortation: "Let 'all who regard the virtue, the honour, and the pa'triotism of the country, *withhold their suffrages* from 'those candidates who offer *ardent spirits* as a bribe 'to secure their elevation to office." But suppose they offer as a bribe to secure their elevation to office, not a glass of brandy and water, but a fresh discovered law of physical geography, precluding all legal restraints on the extension of human bondage—Baltimore platforms, to destroy the liberty of speech, of the press, and the pulpit—indictments for high treason, offering to the Southern Moloch the blood of Christians, who, in the fear of God, refuse when summoned to join in slave-hunts—shall we withhold our suffrages?

On the whole, Sir, I cannot but think that your Society has greatly mistaken its duty to God and man, in shrinking from pronouncing Slavery, as well as gambling and horse-racing, a moral evil. Unquestionably, the Society has acted in perfect accordance with the *general* policy of the Northern Church, both Popish and Protestant. That policy is more easily understood than vindicated. So intimate are our commercial relations with the South, and so dependent are our politicians for the most trifling office upon the support of their party by Southern votes, that to ask them and our merchants to participate in measures and opinions offensive to their Southern patrons, is like asking the favour of them to pluck out a right eye, or cut off a right hand. Of course, the pecuniary and party interests of these men react on the Church and religious Societies with which they are connected. Hence has grown up a secular and ecclesiastical alliance offensive and defensive with Slavery. But this alliance, although undoubtedly embracing many worthy men, is, nevertheless, in direct antagonism with the Gospel of Christ, and has consequently led, and is daily leading, to most disastrous results. It has caused the avowal by men of high position in both Church and State, of principles utterly subversive of that regard for justice and mercy, which is not only one of the peculiar and beautiful features of our holy religion, but also, and especially in a Democracy, one of the strongest safeguards of person and property. Some slaveholders in Congress propose a law, the provisions of which may well have been inspired by that evil and malignant spirit that goeth about seeking whom he may devour—a law openly setting at defiance the established rules of evidence, and levelling in the dust all the barriers erected by the common law around the personal liberty of the citizen—a law requiring every man, at the summons of a miscreant slave-catcher, to assist him in his damnable work—a law seeking by fine and imprisonment to suppress the impulses of humanity and the gushings of Christian sympathy. No sooner is this accursed law proposed than rival politicians contend for the honour of giving it their support, and no sooner is it enacted than the two great rival parties strive to gain votes for their Presidential candidates by pledging their best endeavours to carry it into execution. Many individuals, however, affirm that a law thus requiring them to participate in deeds of cruelty and injustice, is at variance with the divine commands. Forthwith we have our public men and our party press sneering at the "higher law," and insulting all who acknowledge its paramount authority to an act of Congress; worse than all, we have our ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ descanting from their pulpits on the reverence due to the "Powers that be," as ordained of God, and actually urging the duty of obedience to one of the most ungodly and execrable enactments of modern legislation. Occasionally it was indeed admitted, that under peculiar circumstances, and multiplied conditions, we ought to obey God rather than man, but at the same time it was distinctly taught, not merely that we should not *forcibly resist* the Fugitive Law, but that the "higher law" did not dispense with our obligations to catch slaves.

In the zeal, the rivalry and the cruelty displayed in seizing the hapless and innocent fugitive and hurrying him back to the house of bondage, of mental darkness and bodily suffering, lessons of cruelty and injustice have been set by the rich and moral, which will not be lost on the needy and profligate. Many of our wealthy and influential gentleman are sowing seeds which may yet yield to them and their children most bitter fruit.

The shocking insensibility of our churches, religious societies and religious men, to the iniquities of Slavery, of course involves them in gross inconsistencies, degrades the character of the Gospel of Christ, and gives a mighty impulse to infidelity. Never before, in my opinion, has the American Church been in such peril as at present, and from almost every portion of it comes up a cry of distress. There is no failure of *money*. The country is rich, and our wealthy men are liberal, and pride and ostentation and competition secure the erection of gorgeous and expensive churches. But there is a failure of *increase* of ministers and members. The population is outgrowing the church, and the love of many is waxing cold. From men like Tom Paine and most of his followers the church has little to fear. They hate the Gospel because their deeds are evil. Their *lives* are a sufficient antidote to their doctrines. But a new class of converts to infidelity is springing up, men whose fearless and disinterested fidelity to truth, mercy and justice, extort unwilling respect. These men reject the Gospel, not because it rebukes their vices, but because they are taught by certain of its clergy, and the conduct of a multitude of its professors, that it sanctions the most horrible cruelty and oppression, allowing the rich and powerful forcibly to reduce the poor and helpless to the condition of working animals, articles of commerce, and to keep their posterity in ignorance and degradation to the end of time. Every argument wrested from the Bible in behalf of Slavery applies to the bondage of *white* men. Hence the modern pro-slavery divinity justifies the ancient villeinage and the modern serfdom, and would justify their indefinite extension. If it be right to hold three millions of human beings as chattels, it is equally right to hold hundreds of millions. Hence Christianity, if it indeed authorizes this unlimited despotism of the strong over the weak—this vast indefinite annihilation of the conjugal and parental relations—this total abrogation of the rights of conscience, of property, of personal happiness, has surely little claim to our reverence, for its tendency to mitigate the sorrows and troubles of the present life. Certainly it is not wonderful that benevolent, well-meaning men should question the divine authority of a religion sanctioning such tremendous enormities, and whose professors recommend the catching of slaves, as a service acceptable to the Deity, when required by act of Congress.

Most orthodox, Sir, is the faith professed by the Society! I thank my God and Heavenly Father that he has given me grace to embrace with my whole heart and understanding the doctrines you denominate evangelical. But it behoves us all to remember that a workless faith is a worthless faith. Can we refuse obedience to the second of the two great commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets, and yet hope to be saved for our orthodoxy? Very properly your Society has not confined itself to the simple proclamation of Christ and him crucified, but has added practice to faith by assailing sin in its various forms, labouring to convince the sinner of his guilt, and striving to excite him to repentance and reformation. But the sin most rampant in our land—a sin which counts its victims by millions, and its perpetrators, abettors and apologists by millions more—a sin which taints our holy things, enfeebles our churches, corrupts our statesmen, sways our judges, hardens the hearts of our people, blunts their sense of mercy and justice, and which is crowding the ranks of infidelity—this sin may not be mentioned in our fashionable pulpits to "ears polite," nor even alluded to in the multifarious publications of the American Tract Society!

And now, Sir, what is to be done? Your response of course is, NOTHING. You will be at no loss for arguments to show that any Anti-Slavery action on your part will not merely diminish your receipts, and thus lessen your ability to do good, but will also prevent your tracts and volumes from conveying religious truth to the inhabitants of the Slave States. The question of *duty* is not to be decided by an estimate of probable receipts. Nor is it by any means certain that your policy is the wisest in a pecuniary sense, or that one or two tracts condemning American Slavery as a moral evil would prove injurious to your Treasury. The persistence of the American Board in countenancing Slavery in its mission churches, in deference to the contributions of its Southern patrons, called into existence the present flourishing and efficient "American Missionary Association," daily growing in strength and public favour. This new Institution is almost wholly supported by *former* subscribers to the Board. In the last report of the Board, I find the total amount of donations received the preceding year stated at $289,793 90. Of this sum 10,267 25 came from the Slave States and the District of Columbia. Now the *last* report of the Association announces the receipt of $31,134 60 for the past year. Nearly every cent of this sum is virtually *a premium paid by the Board on its Southern subscriptions*. The American Tract Society, if I am not much mistaken, is destined to pay a premium of the like kind.

You will perhaps say that it is better our Southern brethren should be saved as slaveholders, breeders, and traders, than not at all, and therefore you will not touch the subject of Slavery, because if you do, you cannot reach them with your tracts, which under God might lead to their conversion and salvation. If this principle be correct, it is of wide application. The Territory of Utah is acquiring a large population, and will soon claim admission into the Union. The people are Polygamists, but it is better they should be saved as such than not at all. Hence it becomes the duty of the Society, for fear of offending them, to avoid all allusion to the Christian doctrine of marriage, and to "move forward on the simple errand that brought the Saviour into the world, proclaiming Christ and him crucified," and thus rendering the tracts acceptable and useful to our Mormon brethren. So, also, as the usefulness of the minister of Christ depends on his message being heard, he ought to preach smooth things, lest by offending his people, by telling them unwelcome truths, he drive them beyond the sound of the Gospel.

I believe, Sir, not only that this reasoning is unsound, but that the apprehension on which it is founded is groundless. It is not desired by any that your Institution should be converted into an Anti-Slavery, any more than into an Anti-Gambling Tract Society. All that is asked is, that this great influential Christian Association should publicly dissent from the impious claim made by the advocates of American Slavery, that this vast mass of accumulated sin and misery is sanctioned by the God of Mercy and Justice, and allowed by the crucified Redeemer—in other words, that American Slavery should share in the condemnation you bestow on "The Theatre, the Circus and the Horse-race."

Were you to issue one or two tracts against American Slavery as a moral evil, will it be seriously contended that thenceforth none of your thousands of publications on other subjects would be allowed to cross the frontiers of the Slave region? Recollect, Sir, that when a human chattel of three years will bring $300 at auction, and its two parents from $1,500 to $2,000, Slaves are and must be the possession only of the *rich*. By the census of 1840 (I have not the last at hand) there were in the Slave States, 1,016,307 white males over 20 years of age, and of these, various data assure me it is a *very liberal* estimate, that 200,000 were the holders of slaves. And is it possible, Sir, that of this prodigious majority of non-slaveholders, none will read any of your biographies and religious treatises, because they may have heard that you have published one or two little tracts against a sin of which they are themselves guiltless? When "Uncle Tom's Cabin" is sold and read at the South, is it credible that a few slaveholders can exclude all your millions of pages from the vast Southern region? Can your agents and colporteurs be excluded from fifteen States of this Union, because of the mighty mass of your publications, twenty or thirty pages are directed against the conduct of a few rich men? The apprehension that should the Society be faithful to the calls of duty its efficiency for good would be impaired, is not, in my opinion, consistent with that Christian faith so forcibly inculcated in many of your tracts. For myself, I firmly believe that before long the Society will find its present policy productive not of strength, but of weakness. That policy has given birth to the "American Reform Tract and Book Society." In a late acknowledgment of receipts by this infant institution I observe contributions from no less than eight States.

To me it seems obvious that Christians entertaining such contradictory views of the divine attributes of the spirit of the Gospel and of Christian obligations as are involved in the justification and condemnation of American slavery, cannot much longer act together in sending missionaries to preach or employing the press to inculcate a religion respecting the fundamental moral principles of which the two parties entertain such antagonistic opinions.

It is one of the incidents of our imperfect state, that sincere Christians often think they are doing God service, while pursuing opposite paths, and when of course one or the other must tend in a wrong direction. May we accord to others the charity we ask for ourselves, and I pray God that those who condemn in others the sin of oppressing their brethren, may feel their own unworthiness, and remember that they themselves, no less than the wretched slave-catcher, need to be washed in that blood which alone cleanseth from all sin. I am, Rev. Sir, Your obed't servant, WILLIAM JAY.

—*New York Tribune.*

H. BEECHER STOWE AND THE GLASGOW NEW FEMALE A. S. ASSOCIATION.

IT seems that, after all, we are not to have the famed authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" amongst us for some time longer, the distiguished lady having been detained by illness. We confess that at first we felt rather disappointed; but since the announcement was made, a small tract has been put into our hands, entitled "The Friend of the Fugitive," which makes us rather glad that the lady has not come over at the present time, under the auspices of a party that disclaims sectarianism in words, yet proclaims the most narrow and exclusive notions in its authorized publication. We even trust that Mrs. Stowe, when she comes, will have the good sense to steer clear of coteries and cliques, and throw herself upon the sympathies of the great mass of the people, without regard to sect or party.

These remarks have been called forth by an article which appears in "The Friend of the Fugitive," in which Lloyd Garrison, H. C. Wright, and that body of advanced liberals of America who have, in fact, created and been the soul of the Abolitionist movement, are denounced as infidels, seeking to undermine the framework of Society; and all community of feeling or action with them is repudiated. This, to say the least of it, is both impudent and insulting. Because the great originator of the American Anti-Slavery movement—he whose character is as unstained as his courage and resolution have been unbending—who has excited the admiration and respect of all who know him—has allowed religious questions to be discussed with freedom in his journal, and has stood forward for a larger and higher interpretation of Christianity than certain orthodox teachers will admit prudent—he is, forsooth, to be "sent to Coventry," and put down as a dangerous character!

Our Glasgow purists, aping the Pharisees on the other side of the Atlantic, consider that as the Abolitionist movement has acquired an impetus by the sacrifices and labours of the men denounced, and a woman of genius has contributed a powerful work to advance the cause, they can now do without the assistance of Garrison, Wright, and others. Such as go with the new-lights in the justice and expediency of negro emancipation, but do not adopt their religious shibboleth, are henceforth to be cried down by ugly names. This is too bad, and what renders it worse is, that the Society in question, while professing to be without sectarianism, is, nevertheless, rendering themselves an illiberal sect, and attempting to make the Glasgow public participators in their illiberality and shabby policy.

We are given to understand, however, that this attack upon Lloyd Garrison and his coadjutors is but a carrying out of the policy upon which this new Society started into existence some time ago, and that there is scarcely an old or tried friend of negro emancipation in its councils. Mr. Smeal and other leaders have been *tabooed* because they took the part of their attacked American brethren, and sought to conduct the Abolitionist movement on broad and enlightened principles, so as to obtain the aid of men of all religious convictions.

It is much easier to call names than to reason principles. This the new Anti-Slavery Association would seem to have discovered. We have no wish nor intention of discussing the peculiar religious opinions entertained by the Abolitionists on either side of the Atlantic; but we dare say Lloyd Garrison can find as good reasons to his mind for entertaining the religious opinions he considers true as his opponents can advance on the other side. But whether or no, what has this to do with the emancipation of the slave? Here is a great social evil, for the removal of which certain noble-minded men have braved all kinds of danger in their native land. They stood in the breach at a time when not one of their present detractors had the courage even to cry to them "God-speed." A change in opinion has been brought about mainly through their exertions. Ultra-orthodoxy, now finding that the Anti-Slavery cause is becoming fashionable, comes forward, as she has done with regard to many similar movements. She seizes hold of the ground conquered by the pioneers of freedom, and no sooner is in possession than she raises the cry of "infidel" and "mad dog," to make her conquest of the platform complete. This is the policy undoubtedly of the parties in this city into whose hands Mrs. Beecher Stowe has fallen, and being so, we cannot expect much good to result from her visit, or that the demonstration, come off when it may, will be any way creditable to the city, or redound to the honour of the authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." Any party of Abolitionists who would inaugurate a movement by casting dirt on Lloyd Garrison, one of the bravest and noblest men that ever breathed, may please bigots and pharisees, and for a time rally around them those whose notions of human right rarely or ever extend beyond the interests of the conventicle, but they will never command the general support of a British public. This the New Glasgow Anti-Slavery Society have done on the threshold of their present agitation, and, as such, we pronounce their advocacy to be but "as sounding brass or tinkling cymbal."—*Glasgow Sentinel.*

AMERICAN SLAVERY—MEETING IN DUBLIN, IRELAND.

A HIGHLY respectable meeting was held last evening in the theatre of the Mechanics' Institute, chiefly for the purpose of hearing an address from the Rev. Edmund Kelly, a man of colour, and formerly a slave in the United States, on the subject of American Slavery. Mr. James Haughton in the chair.

The Chairman said the subject of Slavery was one of a deeply interesting character, and ought to be regarded as such by all human beings. The fact that a considerable portion of the human family was in a state of bondage ought to stimulate every man into active exertion for the purpose of removing this blot from the face of creation (hear). A recent publication, by Mrs. Stowe, had brought the subject vividly before every civilized nation, and it had caused an unusual degree of excitement. They could not help feeling that there was something extraordinary in the state of things that rendered such a publication necessary, in order to awaken them to a sense of their duty in relation to this question, for it appeared to him that the simple fact of their fellow-men being held in bondage, and regarded as mere chattels, ought to be sufficient to incite them to active exertion for the abolition of such a system. Having kept them in ignorance, and oppressed them in a cruel manner, it was the fashion with some men to charge the coloured race with being deficient in the intellectual powers; but, even supposing the accusation to be true, was it a just reason for treating those poor people with cruelty and contumely (hear, hear)? Should it not rather have the effect of calling forth their benevolent feelings and causing them to employ all the means in their power to elevate them from the inferior position they were said to occupy? He believed that feelings as delightful and sentiments as high were to be found in the bosom of the black man, as any that existed amongst the white races of mankind (hear, hear). Indeed it had been said by those who knew them best that their social feelings were warmer and more intense than were those of the whites. Yet, men did not hesitate to wound those feelings by separating the husband from the wife, and parents from their children without the slightest compunction. He was sorry to be obliged to say that a great body of their own countrymen were deeply implicated in this wickedness. Very large numbers of Irishmen were now residing in America, and it was greatly to be deplored that it was only in very few instance were they known to take the humane view of the question; they were generally found leagued with the oppressors of the coloured race in that land. After some further observations, Mr. Haughton concluded by calling on all present to render all the assistance in their power to effect the abolition of this vile system.

Mr. Richard Allen, on coming forward, was warmly received. They had assembled that night to hear an address from a man who was invested with no common interest. He was the son of an Irishman, and yet he was a slave. He became a Christian preacher, and to enable him to preach the Gospel a sum of 2*l.* had to be paid to the person who claimed him. Having sketched the career of the Rev. Mr. Kelly, he said he knew that many persons absented themselves from meetings of that kind, under the impression that they had enough to do at home, and that they ought not to meddle with the institutions of other countries. From that principle he decidedly dissented. His creed was that the world was his country, and that every man was his brother (hear, hear). Wherever there was distress, or suffering, or wrong, it was his right as a man, and his privilege as a Christian, to endeavour to relieve it. Now, he believed Slavery to be the very antipodes of Christianity, and, therefore, it was his duty to endeavour to effect its abolition (hear, hear). Next to America herself, Ireland was most strongly called upon to wipe out this stain from the American escutcheon. In any language he might use it was his desire to be respectful to the Americans, for he entertained a most kindly feeling towards that noble country. He did not forget how, in 1846 and '47, she stretched out her hand liberally and lavishly to sustain our famishing population, and that she gave almost with prodigality from her abundance to redeem our extreme need. Nor did he forget that America was essentially the home of Irishmen, and that hundreds of thousands of his fellow-countrymen found refuge there (applause). When any one spoke to him about the short-comings of Irishmen, or of their being behind others in industry and energy, he pointed to the magnificent fact, unprecedented in the history of any country, that during the past year the Irish in America had sent home upwards of 990,000*l.* either to relieve their countrymen here or to enable them to proceed to that land where they could live and prosper (cheers). He looked, therefore, upon Americans with very warm feelings, but it was upon this very account that he had raised his voice against their crying sin of Slavery, standing as they did before the world with three millions of the people in bondage in the face of their declaration of independence (hear, hear). Mr. Allen then read the opinions of several eminent divines and statesmen condemnatory of the system of American Slavery, and went on to say that he was scarcely able to express in a sufficiently strong manner his conviction of the imperative necessity that existed for all Christian men to use every exertion for the breaking down of that great obstacle to the progress of mankind—namely, American Slavery. He was aware that many persons were fond of imagining that the condition of the slaves in the southern States was not as bad as was generally believed; but they would find on reference to Mrs. Stowe's celebrated work, the accuracy of which could be relied upon, that the worst accounts they had heard of the treatment of the

slaves were not at all exaggerated (hear, hear) Mr. Allen having read for the meeting a very interesting letter from a New York journal giving a fearful description of the heart-rending scenes the writer had witnessed at slave auctions in some of the southern States, concluded amid loud applause by stating that Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe had arrived that day at Liverpool.

The Rev. Mr. Kelly then presented himself and was greeted with loud applause. He proceeded to lay before the meeting a most interesting, and in some respects painful, statement of his experience of the operation of the slave system in America, and of its degrading and brutalizing effects upon its unfortunate victims. He called attention to the fact, that it was a rule amongst slaveholders to rear up their slaves in utter and absolute ignorance, well knowing that while they remained in this barbarous state they could be the more easily retained in bondage. As a proof of the baneful influence of this system, wherever it existed, he mentioned that although Kentucky was considered as one of the mildest of the slave States, yet he believed it was fully two hundred years behind the most inferior of the free States in civilization. Having given a horrifying description of the various modes of punishing slaves in the western States, he proceeded to show, by reference to facts, that the worst characters sketched in "Uncle Tom's Cabin" were far from being unfair specimens of the classes which they were intended to represent. Towards the close of his discourse the reverend gentleman asserted that the abolition of Slavery was fast approaching, and one of the best proofs he could give of this fact was, that the slaves themselves were beginning to be sensible of their degradation, and to be filled with a strong and increasing desire for freedom. It was most encouraging to him to be enabled to come to the conclusion the world had now pronounced its verdict against Slavery and for the freedom of all mankind, and that everywhere slave-dealers and slaveholders were beginning to be, if not already, regarded as unworthy to associate with humane and Christian men. Having stated that it was his intention to return as soon as possible to his native country, and that for the purpose of enabling him to do so he was raising by contributions a sum of money to purchase his own freedom and to bear his expenses home, he concluded amid loud applause.

The meeting was subsequently addressed in brief terms by some other gentlemen, after which the proceedings terminated.—(*Dublin*) *Freeman's Journal.*

From The Liberator.

REPLY OF WENDELL PHILLIPS, ESQ., TO HON. HORACE MANN.

NORTHAMPTON, April 29, 1853.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE LIBERATOR—*Dear Sir:* Mr. Mann laments that I should injure my cause by a denunciatory spirit, abusive language, and want of decorum. The readers of this correspondence can judge whether he is precisely the person to lecture me on these points.

He makes another attempt to defend his conduct in relation to coloured schools. This attempt leaves my previous statement wholly untouched. It is made up so entirely of quibbles and evasions (I use the terms strictly in a logical sense, and with no intention of personal disrespect), that I should leave it without notice, if there were not some with whom anything that Horace Mann says will pass current for argument. For their sakes, I trouble you with one or two remarks on his defence.

1st. As to the Institution for the Blind. I never represented that to be a 'private institution,' as Mr. Mann charges me with doing. Neither the idea nor the words are to be found in my letter. Yet this is the person who is perpetually talking of misquotation! I said the meetings and records of its Trustees were private. This he has not denied, and nobody can deny. It seems his friend Dr. Howe, the Director of the Institution, has lately searched those records, and finds that it was Mr. Mann himself who asked to have a coloured child admitted. Had Dr. Howe found this fact out ten years ago, and INFORMED THE PUBLIC OF IT THEN, I, for one, should have thanked him. Now it is of little consequence. I cannot see, either, how I am to be blamed for not knowing, in 1848, a fact which has been hidden twenty years in private records; which, it appears, Dr. Howe did not know till he searched his records; which I could not know, and which is now, April, 1853, first published to the world. I may fairly claim that a fact hidden in records to which I have no access, and of whose existence I could have no suspicion, is a fact which I was not bound to know. When your act is one men applaud, 'let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth'; when it is an unpopular one, but needed as a testimony for the truth, 'put it not under a bushel': that is, hide it not for twenty years in the private records of the Institution for the Blind.

The reason why I did not state that the child was refused admission to the Institution on account of his youth, is simply because such would not have been a fair statement of the fact. An informal application, preparatory to a formal one, was made to an individual connected with the Institution. By that individual, as the Trustees themselves confessed in a subsequent Report, 'a wish was expressed that the application should not then be made, as the establishment was just struggling into existence; and it was urged, among other objections, that more harm might be done, if the admission of the boy kept others away, than good could be done to him.' Soon after, the Trustees did themselves the honour to establish a rule that coloured children should be received. This fact, however, was not then communicated to the public. The next application was refused on the alleged reason that the child was too young. The Abolitionists were never satisfied that this was the real reason of his exclusion. But this is a long story. I shall not go into it here. When English huntsmen wish to throw the hounds off the scent, they draw a red herring across the field. My original charge, the only one I have ever made, related to Mr. Mann's conduct as *Secretary of the Board of Education*. No red herring of a Blind Institution will draw me off to discuss his course at other times, and in other offices, especially as he already complains that my letters are too long.

2d. Doubtless the Normal Schools were, as Mr. Mann says, public Institutions. Mr. Mann's *conversations with their teachers* were private, else I might myself have quoted one, which would surprise those who know him only by his recent letters and speeches.

3d. I am sorry the words '*outcast children*' were accidentally dropped in reprinting a quotation from him; but I am glad that the omission made no change in the sense, and occurred in a sentence on which I made no remark and based no argument; which was quoted only to introduce what followed, and the whole of which might have been omitted without injury to his meaning.

4th. His codification of the School Law was made, he says, Nov. 29, 1849. My criticisms bore date Dec. 24, 1847, and Feb. 11, 1848. I could not be expected to take into account, in criticisms made in 1847, and 1848, any merit he earned in 1849.

Mr. Mann thinks some 'well-meaning persons' suppose that coloured children are not admitted into any of the public schools in this Commonwealth. He may be correct in this; but he is very unfair when he adds that they have been led into this error by me and my friends. In all these letters, I have been careful to state that coloured children were excluded 'in some of the large towns and cities,' &c.; and in my original criticism, I named the four or five towns, Boston, Salem, Nantucket, &c., which had established such schools. It is right to add, that nine-tenths of all the coloured people in the State are congregated in these half-dozen large towns and cities. The small country towns did not institute such schools, because, having but three or four coloured families in the town, it would have been too expensive to maintain a separate school for so few. The mistake, therefore, is of no consequence, even if well-meaning people do make it; since these separate schools did exist, till very recently, wherever coloured people existed in any numbers. Boston alone, with her two hundred schools, now enjoys the 'bad eminence' of defying the spirit of our Institutions in this matter.

Mr. Mann states some facts to prove that the plan of separate coloured schools is 'not so bad as many have supposed.' His reasoning shows only that he is entirely unaware of the peculiar hardships and worst results of such schools This cannot proceed from ignorance in one so profoundly acquainted with our public school system as he is. It can result only from the very superficial interest he has taken in the question.

Mr. Mann thinks he may as fairly blame me for not helping him to examine schools, hold meetings and lecture to teachers, as I find fault with him for not, as Secretary, aiding us to get rid of coloured schools. Oh, no! the cases are widely different. I, a private individual, naturally and properly look to the Secretary of the Board of Education, the Head of the School System, to help me abolish a cruel and illegal abuse in that system. But what right has the Secretary, the honoured, trusted, and well-paid agent of the State, to expect private individuals to do his official duties? The State selects him, and not me, to discharge those duties, for the very reason that she is willing to trust him with them, and is not willing to trust me. I can honestly say that I did all I could do, as a private individual, to uphold his hands and maintain his good name against his foes.

I have noticed thus in detail Mr. Mann's *eight specifications*, because I wished to prove my ability to meet him on any ground he chose, and to show your readers how utterly irrelevant they all were to the question at issue between us. But I now wish your readers to observe, that I might have granted all Mr. Mann claims in regard to the Blind Institution, the Normal Schools, the Common School Journal, the Statute of 1845, and the Boston City Solicitor; and all together would not have *touched my charge against him*. The only charge I ever made against him was for misconduct as *Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education*. In my original articles in 1847 and 1848, I stated this very carefully. If I had not already taken up so many of your columns, I should ask you to republish those articles, to show how guardedly they are written. I have made but two references to the matter since, in the first and in the second Letter of this correspondence. In the first I said—

'It is only within a few years that he has opened his mouth on the subject of slavery. For years, *as Sectrary of the Board of Education*, he preserved a profound silence, while his intimate friends were sure he was an Anti-Slavery man at heart. At that time, I had occasion to criticise those statements, *in his Reports*, of half the truth and concealment of real facts, that threatened harm to the coloured man.'

In my second Letter I said:

'A few of us had been besieging, for some ten years, Legislative Committees and City Committees, to get such schools abolished. In our almost hopeless effort, we had borne the insults of politicians and the jeers of the press; but still, at great cost and effort, we persevered. All this while, Mr. Mann was the *head of the School System of Massachusetts*, and it was suspected that, in private, he entirely agreed with us in our views. Such *an officer* we had a right to expect would lead our van. Such, I knew, was the state of public opinion in the rural districts, that a few pages in his *Annual Reports* would be a mighty help to us. Instead of this, he never gave us one word of recognition, countenance or aid. At last, when he did speak on the subject at all, his language was calculated to do so much harm, that I felt called on to protest against it. * * * * *

This is no personal matter between Mr. Mann and myself. It is a grave charge of serious misconduct *in public office*.'

These are *all* the charges I have made in regard to the coloured school question. It will be observed they all refer entirely to Mr. Mann as *Secretary*, and to his *Reports*.

One line of the above—'he never gave us one word of recognition, countenance or aid'—Mr. Mann has quoted some eight or ten times, and based many charges on it. Had he quoted it in its connection—he, that is *the Secretary*, never gave us one word of recognition, &c.—it would have neutralized every argument he has tried to extract from it. While Mr. Mann has been harping so constantly on misquotation, I have let this gross perversion of my meaning pass without remark, rather than seem captious and fault-finding.

I will here take occasion to say the same of his parallel passages about Jesuitism. If any one will read my *whole paragraph* on that point, the correctness of my criticism will be apparent.

I repeat then the charge I originally made, the only one I have ever made, that Horace Mann, *as Secretary of the Board of Education*, never gave our attempt to abolish the coloured schools one word of recognition, countenance or aid. In all this correspondence, Mr. Mann has not offered a fact, an argument, or a witness, to disprove this specific charge. If twenty years ago, in the Blind Institution, he was fully wakened to the importance of this question and the wrong done to coloured children, his subsequent silence, for the last fifteen years, while their claims have been undergoing discussion, and their rights have been stricken down for want of public advocates, becomes more remarkable, and is more to be blamed.

I made the above charge originally, because I thought my duty to the coloured race demanded it. I have alluded to it in these Letters to rebut Mr. Mann's claim, that before entering Congress, he had been so boldly and frankly Anti-Slavery as to leave me no excuse for criticising his Congressional speeches, even if their language seemed equivocal. I have been very careful to substantiate the charge for this reason. We Anti-Slavery lecturers are obliged every day to make statements, the full evidence of which we have not time to offer. When one of these charges is denied, it becomes us to lay before the public the amplest evidence of its truth; that our hearers may feel at all times sure, that in relying on us they are relying on men cautious in making charges, and able fully to prove those they make. If you deprive us of this reputation, we lose all power to help the slave.

Mr. Mann thinks to excite prejudice against us by allusion to our rebuke of Kossuth and Father Mathew. That story only shows how impartial the Abolitionists have always been. When Father Mathew, to help teetotalism, denied the Anti-Slavery principles which he had always professed, we rebuked him. When Kossuth, in order to get help for Hungary, lavished eulogy on our Government, joined hands with slaveholders, and expressly promised silence in regard to Slavery as the price he was willing to pay for our national aid, we rebuked him, as recreant to Truth, Justice and Liberty. Mr. Mann's pen has wide influence. We will never complain, no matter how often he tells that story. I do not know how he and his friends feel when they look back on their parts in the Kossuth drama. Rumour says some of them regard it as a delirious dream, and do not care to hear it mentioned. But I assure him that we are perfectly satisfied with the parts we acted on that occasion. The oftener he reminds the world of them, the more he will please us. We rebuked those men in the same spirit that we rebuked the Secretary of Education, when he kept silence on the coloured school question, that he might gain and exert more influence in behalf of the white children of the State.

With all respect to Mr. Mann, I must say that I do not think his random and disconnected remarks on my argument about voting under this Constitution need any attention from me. If I stop to notice one or two points, it will not be from any real necessity, but only for the sake of those who may be misled by the authority of his name. He thinks I do not make out my assertion, that taxes are wrung from me without my consent, unless I imitate the Quakers, and oblige Government to sell my goods in order to collect the tax. Let me remind him that when Government imposes a burden upon us, giving us notice that it does not care whether we assent or not, the very nature of the case excuses us from making a protest. We may make it, if we choose, but it is not *necessary* No one has any right to infer our assent, if we omit such protest. Each man will judge how far and in what way he will resist and protest against such things. He will choose such form of resistance or protest as he thinks best adapted to secure public attention to his case, and to the principles for which he suffers. Neither Paul, nor Bishop Latimer, nor Sir Harry Vane, seem to have thought it necessary to go to fisticuffs with the executioner; and thus they failed to use absolutely *all* the power God and Nature had left them of resisting their fate, and showing that they did not *assent*, but only *submitted* to it. But it would be rather hard to infer from this that they assented to their own deaths, and had no right to utter a word against the men who murdered them. The world is rather of opinion that, in all such cases of the exercise of despotic power, the victim has a right to choose how far and in what way he will resist. The old Quakers did wisely, as a matter of policy, in letting their chairs be sold on the road-side. It drew attention to their principles, their conscientiousness, and their persecutions. I consider it best in Boston, in this middle of the nineteenth century, to protest by way of the press and the Anti Slavery meeting Hitherto, I have found these sufficiently effectual. I shall be happy to receive any suggestions from Mr. Mann as to making these forms of protest more efficient, discovering better ones. In the mean time, I do not consider that I am *obliged*, in principle, to make any protest at all. If, however, Mr. Mann insists on believing that taxes are a thing which men in general are so fond of paying that every individual will be considered in love with them, unless he absolutely exhausts himself in convincing the world of the contrary, I must leave him to certain old gentlemen, Grotius, Puffendorff and Vattel, who settled these theories of government long ago.

I should think Mr. Mann's reference to the Connecticut deacon's vote, with a prayer endorsed on it, to be a jest, if he had not mentioned it with approbation once before when addressing a Free Soil Convention in 1851 His notions of prayer differ from mine. I am so old-fashioned as to think that 'long prayers' will never justify us in voting for a man who 'devours' not only widows' houses, but the widows themselves.

I really cannot conceive how, on Mr. Mann's theory, we are to decide what is law in this country. Is the decision of the Supreme Court in the 'Prigg case' law, in this country, and until it is changed? O, no! says Mr. Mann, I am not bound by the decisions of the Supreme Court. Congress is a *co-ordinate* body, and can make and settle law as well as the Supreme Court.*

Very well. Congress has just enacted the Fugitive Slave Law. Is that law until it is repealed? O, no indeed! says Mr. Mann again, the Supreme Court has not yet settled whether the slave is entitled to a jury trial or not. I am not bound by that Fugitive Slave Act of Congress.

By what, then, is Mr. Mann, either as citizen or legislator, bound? *By his own opinion and conscience*, he tells us. Of course, there are just twenty odd million who have exactly the same rights as he; and this seems to me a singular method of securing that *uniformity of law* which is necessary to make a Government. Practically, this is anarchy.

If Mr. Mann thinks I misrepresent him, and asserts that he does consider himself bound by a statute while it stands on the statute book, then I ask him what right he has to call the proceedings in the Sims case illegal, and deny the legal right of the Marshal and Judge to return a slave under the slave law, as he did in his letter of April 4th? If he was bound by that Law, so were they. And when, knowing that Law was on the statute book, he accepted a seat in the 32d Congress, he must have foreseen that Marshals would be constitutionally bound to execute it, and he constitutionally bound to pay them for so doing. Could an Anti-Slavery man assume such an office?

Mr. Mann may choose either horn of the dilemma he prefers. One theory leads him to anarchy: the other, into the jaws of the Fugitive Slave Law.

Mr. Mann, like all Free Soilers, is constantly telling us what the Supreme Court is not, and what Congress is not; about which matters we make no inquiry. I will again state to him the question we do wish answered. According to the theory which he and they prefer, there are three great *co-ordinate* powers in this Government: the President, Congress and the Supreme Court—each entitled to Construe the Constitution. Now, Congress, one of these great powers, has enacted the Fugitive Slave Law; it has been approved by the President, another of these great powers; so far as it has ever come before any Justice of the Supreme Court, it has been declared constitutional. Here, then, is a law, sanctioned by two of the three great powers, and, to say the least, unquestioned by the third. Now, while it stands thus on the statute book, do Free Soil members of Congress mean to obey it in good faith, by appointing officers to execute it, paying them, and sustaining them in their duty? If so, how do they reconcile all this with their Anti-Slavery profession, that to return slaves to a master is sin? If they do not mean to act in such good faith, is not government resolved into anarchy, where each man does what seems 'right in his own eyes'? And what use will there be in the repeal of this Law, and in enacting Mr. Mann's boasted panacea, JURY TRIAL, if subsequent Congresses are at liberty, on this theory, to leave the new law disobeyed? What becomes of his theory, that the President and Congress are great *co-ordinate* powers, authorized to construe the Constitution, if, when they *have construed it and enacted accordingly, nobody is legally bound to obey*? He tells us members of Congress are not bound to obey the Fugitive Slave Law, and (Letter of April 4th) that no Judge or Marshal has any legal right to do any act under it; and again (Letter of April 19th), that if Senator SUMNER should 'confirm a man, who he knows or has reasonable ground to suspect will execute' it, he would be guilty! Here, then, *according to his theory*, is a law which nobody is legally bound to obey! Now, will Mr. Mann, please answer the above four questions?

I quoted Mr. Mann's assertion, that a decision of the Supreme Court was 'the law of the land until it is set aside.' He evades this by making it apply only to citizens, and not to legislators. I might reply that legislators are in the same condition as citizens, so far as appointing officers and voting pay for the execution of existing laws are concerned. But I must remind him that he spoke the words as a legislator to the legislators. When I quoted his speeches before, as to Free Soilers, he claimed that I should make this distinction. If it is true of those extracts, it is of this. No man has a right to play thus fast and loose with his readers. But, let Free Soilers take note, he now allows that *citizens are subordinate to a decision of the Supreme Court* To be sure, he adds '(*except in cases of conscience*).' But Mr. Mann is lawyer enough to know that the parenthesis is inadmissable. Government, having enacted a law, cannot take notice of the conscientious scruples of citizens. These have place in religion, where the right of private judgment is allowed; but make no difference in a man's *legal obligations*, though, of course, they do in his *moral* obligations.

Mr. Mann says, 'Because government is a necessity, we (that is, Free Soilers) take part in those departments of it which involve no violation of the Higher Law.'

Mr. Sumner sits, a Free Soiler, in the Senate of the United States. He will not say, in the face of that Senate and the country, that it is his purpose never to aid, during his whole six years, in appointing any Judge or Marshal or District Attorney of the United States. Yet he knows that, if he does so aid, the Judges, Marshals and Attorneys whom he shall appoint will be constitutionally bound, according to the law, *as settled, at present, both by Congress and the Supreme Court*, to return fugitive slaves. This, then, according to Mr. Mann, is a department which involves no violation of the Higher Law!

Mr. Mann himself, as Representative, has sworn to uphold this Government, and has done so. He voted, he tells us, for the appropriation bills. He says (p. 242) 'The appropriation bill is one on which the working and even *the continuance of the Government* depend Without it, the machinery of the State must cease to move.' What, then, is this Government, which he has spent the last four years in upholding? It is a Government which, he says, in his published volume of Speeches, secures to the slaveholder the right to follow and retake his flying slave. Dissolve the Union, and not only will this right cease, and the hunted mother find refuge in any one of the Northern States; but, Mr. Mann says (p. 533), 'at the end of thirty years, there will be no slave in all their (the Southern) borders.'

It is a Government which encourages slaveholding, by giving, in its three-fifths slave basis of representation, additional political power to the slaveholder for every slave that he can contrive to buy or breed.

It is a Government which encourages and protects the slaveholder, and crushes the heart of the slave, by giving to *that Congress* in which Mr. Mann sat, power to call out the militia 'to suppress *insurrections*;' and which promises to 'protect each State against *domestic violence*, on application of its Legislature or Executive.' A Union which knows that in one half its States, three millions of blacks are held as slaves, promises to put down *insurrections*. A Union which knows that in those States the Legislatures and Executives are *white slaveholders*, promises to protect them against *domestic violence*, when such Legislatures and Executives request it!

March 4, 1849, Mr. Mann's vote, with others, while 'the sun of a Sabbath morning shone full into the windows of the Capitol,' saved this Government from destruction, and enabled it to continue: and of an act which included this in its consequences, he says (p. 243), 'a holier work never was done on that holy day'! To take part in such departments of the Government involves no violation of the Higher Law! Mr. Mann voted to pay Peleg Sprague for trying the alleged rescuers of Shadrach, and Charles Devens for returning Sims for Georgia. He knew, when he accepted his seat in Congress, that such bills would come before him, and that he would be legally bound to pay them. But this is a department of Government which involves no violation of the Higher Law! And while filling these and other similar offices, Mr. Mann uses his leisure hours in holding up to the public scorn and contempt, the men who serve the same government and uphold the same laws as he does!

All this, HORACE MANN being judge, is Free Soil Anti-Slavery! Tell it not Georgia; publish it not in the streets of Charleston!

Mr. Mann next mounts a very gallant steed, and makes an amusing excursion, talking all the while of my attempt to secure the ballot for women. I shall not follow him, having said, in my last letter, all I wish to say on that point. No red herring of a woman's claim to vote will draw me off from the great question at issue between us, viz.: How a Free Soiler, Mr. Mann, for instance, justifies himself in swearing to support, and in supporting, a Constitution which he professes to think a pro-slavery instrument?

As Mr. Mann, however, seems really confused about this matter, I beg him to observe that, in the extract he makes from my letter of March 21st, '*voter*' means *one who actually votes;* and that I have never asked government to make woman *voters* in this sense—which, indeed, no Government could do—but only to give the *right* to vote if they choose. This distinction, between one who votes and one who is entitled to vote but does not do so, destroys his syllogisms and clears away much of the confusion into which he seems to have fallen: especially that a non-voter is perjured, &c. &c.,—an idea I never entertained, any more than that my friend GERRITT SMITH was so; though some such suspicion seems to have occasionally troubled Mr. Mann.

Mr. Mann thinks my analogies of Webster and Dewey defending Slavery, coloured men getting enrolled in the army, and each man's choosing his own creed, are no true analogies; because all these are *rights to do right things:* while I regard woman's voting under this government a wrong thing. Indeed! I cannot agree with him. I cannot think that Dewey's legal right to defend the Fugitive Slave Law, and the duty of sending one's mother into Slavery, is a right to do a *right thing!* So of the coloured man's right to shoulder his musket in defence of this 'covenant with death and agreement with hell,' and of a man's right to be a pro-slavery Presbyterian or Catholic, Infidel or Mormon, or even a member of Congress, if he will. All these seem to me, emphatically, legal rights to do, what I think *very wrong things*. I place by their side the right to drink rum (not to sell it), and to worship idols. If this State should forbid a man, by statute, to drink rum or to worship idols, I should oppose it, and petition in favour of his legal right to do these very wrong things.

If the community are, in all cases, justified in refusing a man the legal right to do what they think wrong, then the men who shot LOVEJOY were excellent citizens, since they thought it was very wrong for him to publish an Anti-Slavery paper in Alton. But if the rule be, *as it certainly is*, that we are never justified in refusing a man his rights, merely because we know he will use them in a way we think wrong, then I am consistent in urging this Government, as I would any other sinner, to do its duty, by giving woman her right to vote, however wrong I may think voting under this Government to be.

Indeed, it is the old question, that has been fought over and over again so many times, in so many centuries. The Popes said—some Popes, too, that did not dwell at Rome—if you give the people the Bible, and allow them to choose their creeds, you 'dig a pitfall of temptation' for them; they will fall into damnable errors, and many a soul be lost; you tempt them to their destruction

Very likely replied Luther and Roger Williams. But God gave them these rights, and if, in the exercise of them, they are tempted and fall, to Him let them answer, not to us.

The old despots, from Charlemagne to Charles Stuart, said, if you allow the people to govern themselves, you bring in all manner of abuses.

No doubt of it, said Algernon Sydney. I have read of Athens, of Socrates and his hemlock, and of Aristides, with his unhappy title of the Just; but, nevertheless God gave men these self-evident rights. On him, not on me, rests the responsibility of their use of them.

So of Mr. Mann's fear lest I dig a 'pitfall of temptation' for the women of Massachusetts, and lest they use the *rights* I claim for them in doing what I think very wrong. I grant that this is very likely to happen Nevertheless, still I stand with Rogers Williams and Algernon Sydney, and cry out—'Give every one his *rights*. I am not my brother's keeper. God does not ask me to help Him govern His world by excluding a fellow-being from *his rights*, for fear he should misuse them.' My only surprise is to see HORACE MANN over there, on the other side of the way, with Ignatius Loyola, Pope Gregory and Charles Stuart. I know he will be swift to change his place the moment the mist clears off, and he recognises his comrades.

Mr. Mann now becomes respectful towards non-voters, and states that he has 'long wished' for 'their co-operation at the polls.' Indeed! In the former part of this letter, he seems to doubt whether there were any worth mentioning, and two years ago, at Lancaster, he assured his Free Soil friends that all the disunionists in Massachusetts might 'be counted on a man's finger and toes'! But Mr. Mann has seen more of the disunionists within the last few weeks. I am glad we improve on acquaintance. But how can our *co-operation at the polls* be of any value, seeing that in Massachusetts, our strongest State, we only match 'a man's finger and toes'!

Mr. Mann finishes by a wish that this discussion should be confined to constitutional points. More than half, nearer two thirds, of each of my letters have been on these points. In regard to the rest, I must tell him that, standing as I do before this community, I cannot allow any man, worthy of an answer, to deny the truth of my statements about the Anti-Slavery cause and our public men. My reputation for caution in making charges, and ability to prove those I make, is one of the best weapons I have to wield in the Slave's behalf. No man will wrest it from me without a struggle. But for this, I should long since have ceased this correspondence. In any other circumstances, self-respect would have prevented my replying to his second letter, which was, as all its successors have been, in temper and tone entirely unworthy the notice of a gentleman.

Further: I have repeatedly asked Mr. Mann his opinion of the Fugitive Slave Clause. *He has never given me an answer.* He says, very truly, 'there are various and even hostile interpretations of the Constitution' on this point. Full knowledge of his views upon it is a necessary preliminary to any profitable discussion between us. If I wish to discuss the Constitution with men who consider it an Anti-Slavery Instrument, I can readily find enough men, and able men too, to engage with me. If I wish to consider our constitutional duties with men who take the Constitution in its usual sense, there are many in that class who will debate with me. But what profit or satisfaction can I have in discussing these questions with a mind, the mongrel product of both these theories; which takes refuge from my arguments, now in one theory and now in another, refusing me, all the while, any clear knowledge of its real opinion? If I debate, it shall be with a man; one who holds his opinions with his whole heart and soul and mind and strength, and has none to conceal. Life with me is too busy and earnest to waste its hours with a fencer, whose only aim is to chop logic. Truly yours, WENDELL PHILLIPS.

* The decisions of the Supreme Court are often a mere affirmance, as in the Prigg case, of some law of Congress; and hence this *co-ordinate* power. Congress, is as much involved in them as the Court itself. Such decisions rest generally on both of Mr. Mann's foundations, a law of Congress and a decision of the Supreme Court.

MR. MANN AND THE CASTE SCHOOLS.

MR. GARRISON: Mr. Mann, in his reply to Mr. Phillips, claims much more credit for his opposition to caste schools than his facts will warrant. Indeed, whatever may have been his opinion respecting their illegality, and the gross injustice of subjecting the coloured children to attend these schools or none, he did, by his own showing, take care that the public should know nothing of his views or opinions on that subject. The controversy respecting these schools in Salem, Nantucket and Boston was of sufficient notoriety and interest to attract a very considerable public attention; but more especially as regards the coloured schools in this city, where, for four years, the coloured people and their friends brought the subject before the Schoool Committee I was, throughout the controversy, a member of the Primary School Committee, and also a member of the last sub-committee to whom the subject was referred by the Board. In endeavouring to strengthen the claims of the coloured population to equal common school privileges, we availed ourselves of such authority and favouring opinions and practices as might serve that purpose; and it was suggested, that if, as was supposed, Mr. Mann was with us in sentiment, a word from him would be extremely desirable. To this it was replied, that he had declined or would decline to say any thing or take any part on the question, for the reason that it was an unpopular matter, and might, if he meddled with it, impair his influence on other questions connected with his official duties as Secretary.

Whether he was correctly reported or not, I do not know; but of this I am confident, neither party made any use of his name or authority, one way or the other, in the matter. And I may add, that neither at that time nor since have I ever seen or heard of a word from him on this subject, until this present controversy between himself and Mr. Phillips.

Boston, May 2. 1853. EDMUND JACKSON.
—*Liberator.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†‡† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1853

NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

THE ANNUAL MEETING of this Convention will be held in Boston, in the Melodeon, on WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, May 25th and 26th, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. Of all the Anti-Slavery gatherings in this country, numerous and spirited as many of them are, none excite so much interest or bring such numbers together as this conventional body. The widest and most cordial invitation to be present, and participate in its proceedings, is given to Anti-Slavery men and women, in whatever position they may stand; and to all manly opponents of the cause of emancipation, a free platform will be offered on that occasion, as it has ever been—for liberty never yet had cause to dread the light, or to shrink from an open encounter with Slavery. It has been deemed advisable to occupy but two instead of three days, as heretofore; but it is intended to make the opening session not merely preliminary, but as spirited in the way of discussion as practicable. A prompt attendance, therefore, is requested, that every hour may be profitably employed in the slave's behalf.

By order of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society,

FRANCIS JACKSON, *President.*

R. F. WALLCUT, *Secretary.*

THE ANNIVERSARY.—Our paper goes to press at too early an hour to allow us the opportunity to notice the proceedings of the Anniversary. Next week we shall be able, we trust, to give a satisfactory report of what may be said and done, and to take an encouraging view of the prospects of the American Society for the year to come.

GREAT ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION IN CINCINNATI.

WE have not been able hitherto to pay adequate attention to the proceedings of a large and harmonious Anti-Slavery Convention, held in Cincinnati, on the 19th, 20th and 21st ultimo. The official report has not yet reached us, but we must not longer delay our notice of a meeting so important in its relations to the Anti-Slavery Cause.

It appears from the reports before us that the Convention was organized as follows:

President—SAMUEL LEWIS.

Vice-Presidents—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, of Boston; G. W. Julian, of Indiana; C. L. Remond, of Salem, Mass; Mrs. Ernst and Mrs. Guild, of Cincinnati, and Judge Stevens of Madison.

Secretaries—J. W. Chaffin, of Clinton Co.; W. H. Day, of Cleveland; J. W. Towner, from Medina Co.; and J. McEldowny, of Cleveland.

Business Committee—Wm. Lloyd Garrison; Dr. W. H. Brisbane; W. H. Day; M. R. Robinson; Judge Stevens; Dr. Brooke, of Clinton; Mr. Julian; Mrs. Harwood; Mrs. Coleman; C. Donaldson; and Mrs. A. H. Ernst.

Finance Committee—Messrs. Ernst and Harwood.

The Convention was called on the most catholic basis, Abolitionists of every shade and party being invited to participate in the proceedings; but the self-styled 'evangelical' Abolitionists, represented by the Cincinnati *Christian Press*, with few exceptions, stood aloof, fearing to soil their reputation for piety by associating with those whose religious convictions differed from their own. That faithful and venerable friend of the slave, Rev. John Rankin, and Rev. W. H. Brisbane (Baptist) were not ashamed to be seen battling for freedom side by side with Garrison. One or two Wesleyan clergymen also participated freely in the proceedings. But these were exceptions. The Orthodox Anti-Slavery of Cincinnati refused all co-operation, and the *Christian Press*, unable to find anything in the proceedings to justify the imputations of 'infidelity' by which it sought to excite the prejudices of its readers, and lacking the manliness to confess its fault, now seeks a cover for its hostility in the pretence that Abolitionists who differ from each other on Constitutional and other similar questions cannot meet together in Convention without imposing a check upon each other's freedom of speech! That this pretence is without foundation in fact the reports of the Convention and those who were present clearly show.

The principal speakers were Messrs. Rankin, Garrison, Samuel Lewis, C. L. Remond, W. H. Day, M. R. Robinson, Hon. G. W. Julian, and E. Hamlin. Among the letters received and read was the following from Cassius M. Clay:

WHITE HALL P. O., Madison Co., Ky., March 25th, 1853.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Your letter of the last month was, in consequence of my absence from home, unanswered till now.

In your letter, in addition to the printed circular, you say I am "especially invited" to be present at the Anti-Slavery Convention to be held on the 19th proximo, in Cincinnati.

For this special honour, accept my grateful acknowledgements. Let me ever be *remembered* by the friends of Human Justice, rather than be *honoured with place* by the enemies of the Right.

If my engagements will allow, I shall certainly be with you—though I cannot now decide.

You say W. L. Garrison will be present. I wish to say a word of that man. As a man, he stands first among living men, because he has laboured most of all in that cause which is of most worth to mankind. It is not for me to say whether, with equal firmness and sensibility to the right, he might or might not have done more service in the great cause. It is enough that with whatever talent was loaned him by Deity, with that he has zealously at all hazards of all things contended for the highest interests of men. The day for his appreciation has not come! There is, however, one saying of his traducers, and the traducers of those who act with him, which I will notice—That "they have set back the cause of emancipation by agitation." Nothing is more false. The cause of emancipation advances only with agitation. Let that cease, and Despotism is complete. The slaveholders have just as much intention of yielding up their slaves, as the most of the kings of the earth have of laying down, for the benefit of the people, their sceptres! How long will, without agitation, kingdom's last!

Again, they say the chains of the slave are tightened by the fierceness of discussion. Be it so. When a chain gets very tight, it may perhaps break!

Agitation, then, ought not to cease. "Uncle Tom" proves that there is yet vitality in it! Very well written, they say, but then it is an exaggeration of the evils of the "peculiar institution." No human ingenuity can colour that which allows to be done all that the human heart can conceive of Diabolism! For one case of "Legreeism," I'll show you a dozen of infinitely exceeding horror! But enough. The thing is axiomatic Delanda est Carthago!

I am very truly,
Your o't serv't,
C. M. CLAY.

C. DONALDSON, &c., Committee, &c.

The following resolutions were adopted after full and free discussion:

Resolved, That the Anti-Slavery enterprise, as such, is technically neither evangelical nor heterodox, neither sectional nor exclusive, neither sectarian nor complexional; but commends itself to the universal conscience and reason of mankind, as self-evidently just and righteous, as worthy of all acceptation, as constituting the corner-stone of the great temple of human brotherhood, and as embodying the spirit of impartial love and disinterested philanthropy.

Resolved, That as abolitionism rejoices in the light, and glories in the most searching investigation; and as it magnanimously permits those who attend its conventions, either to apologize for the slaveholder or to defend the slave, either to assail or support abolition principles, it follows that no man who claims to possess any manhood, or any faith in God, has any excuse for absenting himself from that platform, but should be willing to avow his own convictions, or to be freely interrogated as to his position in regard to those who are pining in the American house of bondage.

Resolved, That if persons of conflicting religious or political views can and do associate together for purposes of gain, or for the promotion of any other measure touching the general welfare, without being responsible for each other's sentiments on other subjects than the one distinctive purpose they have in view, then they can and should coalesce for the deliverance of three millions of our enslaved countrymen, without being held responsible for the peculiar sentiments they may entertain, as individuals, on any other question aside from that of Slavery.

Resolved, That the abolitionists of this country are as much interested in the welfare, prosperity and safety of the slaveholders, as they are in the liberation and elevation of the slaves; that, in the abolition of the entire slave system, no actual property will be impaired or destroyed, but every kind of property will be enhanced and improved in value; that freedom is industrious, economical, enterprising, and fertile in useful expedients and beneficient discoveries, while Slavery is indolent, wasteful, turning into barrenness the most fruitful soil, and paralyzing all the inventive and progressive faculties; and that emancipation can be as triumphantly defended on the ground of political economy and material prosperity, as it can be on moral and religious principle.

Resolved, That by turning slave labour into free labour, and inspiring it with the hope of remuneration, instead of coercing it under the lash, the entire South may be made the abode of peace and plenty, and the very Eden of our land.

Resolved, That the deadliest enemies of the South are found among those of the North, who are arrayed against the Anti-Slavery enterprise, who represent the abolition of Slavery to be a measure fraught with incalculable evil, and who thus strengthen the slaveholder in his purpose to rivet forever the chains of his miserable victims.

Resolved, That the nearest duty is the first duty to be faithfully and energetically performed by Abolitionists; that before expending the force of their denunciations upon the Slaveholding South, they are bound to grapple with whatever in legislation or public sentiment manifests a proscriptive and tyrannous spirit against the coloured man in the State where they live; and to make its suppression their constant and immediate concern.

Resolved, therefore, That the political disfranchisement of the coloured citizens of Ohio beig a most unjust and proscriptive act, and a dark stain upon the escutcheon of the State, and furnishing, as it does, weapons to the slaveholder to strike down the rising spirit of emancipation, should be vigorously denounced, and held up to popular condemnation, until it cease to exist.

Resolved, That Anti-Slavery is not simply an issue with the Fugitive Slave Law, or opposition to Slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, or, resistance to the further extension of chattel servitude, or giving succour and shelter to the fugitive slave, or contributing occasionally to the funds of our movement; but it is life-giving and life-embracing, demanding inflexibly and uncompromisingly the immediate and eternal overthrow of the slave system, and a full recognition of the equal rights of all who dwell on the American soil, without regard to origin or complexion.

Resolved, That the claims of the slave to freedom admit of no postponement for the convenience, profit, safety or success of any institution, sect, party or enterprise whatever; but are to be enforced as paramount in solemnity and importance to all other considerations.

Resolved, That the party which is in alliance with slaveholders ought to be repudiated as unworthy of any countenance or co-operation; and the church or sect which gives the right hand of Christian fellowship to those who claim and hold property in human flesh, ought to be abandoned as an anti-Christian body, in order to be true to freedom.

The two following were introduced by Mr. Garrison and supported by him in an able speech, to which several members replied; but no vote was taken upon them. The discussion appears to have been fraternal on both sides:

Resolved, That the government which is moulded and fashioned by the Slave Power; that the Constitution which grants aid and protection, and gives unusual prerogatives to the holders and breeders of slaves; that the Union which was formed and is maintained only by immolating one-sixth portion of the people of the land on the altar of Slavery, ought to be excommunicated, at whatever hazard, cost or opprobrium, by every one claiming to be the friend, representative and advocate of the slave.

Resolved, That the vital and all-conquering motto of the Anti-Slavery movement is, 'no union with slaveholders, religiously or politically,' and, therefore, by a stern moral necessity, every consistent Abolitionist is forced to disfranchise himself for conscience' sake; to take his position outside of the present government; and to call for the institution of a new government, wherein shall be recognised neither slaveholders or slaves as among human existences.

Mr. Garrison speaks of the meeting in the following terms:

On Tuesday morning came the opening session of the Anti-Slavery Convention, in Masonic Hall, a very spacious room. Nine great meetings were held consecutively, friends of the cause being present from Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, and Kentucky. The evening gatherings far exceeded the dimensions of the hall. The spectacle was animating and sublime. Though the largest liberty of speech was taken; though the strongest denunciations of Slavery and its abettors were uttered; and though, in my remarks, I occupied the most 'ultra' ground, and declared the duty and necessity of a disolution of the Union, and charged the Revolutionary Fathers with aggravated criminality in compromising away the rights of the coloured population, in order to subserve their own interests; yet, throughout all the proceedings, not a disorderly act was witnessed, not a solitary hiss was heard. A hallowed spirit seemed to brood over the deliberations, and nothing could be more manly than the deportment of all present. Samuel Lewis, the Free Soil candidate for Governor of Ohio, presided on the occasion, with admirable tact and ability. He is reputed to be the most effective public speaker in the West, and possesses a natural oratory which kindles and glows, as he proceeds, till every thing is melted by its intensity. He has a large breadth of character, and evinces a genial and true catholic spirit. All seemed to be gratified by the results of the Convention.

On the next Sunday evening, I delivered a public lecture on Slavery in Masonic Hall to a very respectable audience.

The Anti-Slavery *Bugle*, whose editor was present, publishes full reports, and comments thereupon as follows:

As usual, the great body of the church and ministry of the city, and of the country, were unrepresented, and are to be found among the opponents of this, and of every other hearty Anti-Slavery movement. It seems to us it must now be evident to those who are disposed to be most blind or sceptical on this subject, that the churches and the ministry do themselves think that their organizations and institutions and principles, are opposed to the principles of justice, as taught by Anti-Slavery. They are not agreed with Abolitionists of any school, and especially can they not agree with them, when they meet in fraternal spirit, for free speech and thorough action. Hence they will not walk with us. They are the decided practical enemies of the slave The church and its dogmas and institutions are the gods they serve, and they will have no other gods before them. Of all the ministers of Cincinnati, not one was there except Messrs. Lewis and Brisbane, to give countenance to the convention. Mr. Boynton, who has been deemed the champion of Anti-Slavery among the ministers of the city, not only gave no countenance to the convention, but gave previously to its meeting, his decided influence against it. In his paper, the *Christian Press* he undertook impertinently to catechise Mr. Garrison, and raised against him the senseless cry of infidel, to destroy the effect of his labours. Not content with this, the Sunday previous to the Convention, he preached two sermons designed to bear directly against it. What sort of a report he may have given of the convention we cannot say, as he has recently cut us off from his exchange list. Several of the city papers reported the proceedings briefly, with fairness and impartiality. The *Gazette* and the *Commercial*, especially. While the *Inquirer* and *Nonpareil* distinguished themselves by caricaturing and misrepresenting its proceedings.

It was a grand meeting, and the noble women who originated and sustained it have in common with all the friends of the slave, occasion to rejoice in its complete success, and in its extended and happy influence

SOUTHERN ANTI-SLAVERY.—The *Jefferson* (Mo.) *Inquirer*, supporter of Col. Benton, recently ventured to speak in commendation of Uncle Tom's Cabin, and to "recommend it to the perusal of our [its] friends and the public generally." Mrs. Stowe having quoted its testimony in the KEY to the Cabin, the St. Louis *Republican*, the leading Whig journal of Missouri, comments thereupon as follows:

Now Messiers of the *Inquirer*, we propose placing you at the bar, and it will go hard with us if your true position is not clearly marked out and defined before we have done with you. "You do not consider the book (Uncle Tom's Cabin) as a gross libel on a portion of our people;" you say "that it is a mirror of several classes of people you have in your mind's eye." In plain English you admit that the subject is fairly stated, and approve of the conclusions drawn against Slavery and slave owners. You praise the moral worth of the book, or, in other words, you give in your adhesion to the principles it advocates, and is intended to disseminate. You may think to save yourselves by your parenthesis, or after thought, of "barring some objections to it." But you shall not. Taken in connection with the rest of your paragraph, this phrase means that you think some of "the scenes are too highly coloured and too strongly drawn from the imagination." It cannot be tortured into anything else so long as the English language is subject to certain fixed and unalterable rules. These objections, however, you deem of such small importance that you do not, in a subsequent sentence, hesitate to recommend the book to your readers. Does this not place you in the position of an open and professed approver of Abolition doctrine? Most unquestionably it does; and you now fight under the banner which Mrs. Stowe has unfurled, side by side with Fred Douglass, in whose honourable company your name is honourably mentioned.

The *Republican* expects, doubtless, to make capital for its party by this show of zeal in behalf of Slavery, and by its promptness in arraigning the editor of the *Inquirer* as an offender for daring to speak an honest and free word; but the progress of truth in Missouri, within the last few years, leads us to hope that its expectations may prove delusive. If the *Republican* only dared to speak its mind as freely as the *Inquirer* has done, it would not probably be long in showing the world that it is quite as deeply imbued with Anti-Slavery principles as its more independent cotemporary.

Mrs. Frances D. Gage recently removed from Morgan County, Ohio, to St. Louis. In a letter, written soon after her arrival in the latter place, and published in the *Bugle*, she thus alludes to the state of public sentiment on the Slavery question:

Slavery is here, but in "*its mildest form*," so say the people. There is an outspoken testimony against it: the *National Era* and the New York *Tribune* are popular papers with the citizen—and I have heard the "peculiar institution" as harshly dealt by, since I came to the city, as Parker Pillsbury himself would desire. If it were not for this foul blot upon the escutcheon of this great State, so full of internal wealth, and external prosperity, I could learn to love Missouri, and why should I not, even with that? not its Slavery, not its unjust and inhuman laws that bind one man the chattel slave of another, but its hills and valleys, its fields and woods, and its mighty masses of people coming from all quarters of the globe, to make a home here. Are not all brethren and children of the same Father? and does not the same sun warm, the same breezes refresh, and the same all-wise Jehovah send his rain upon the just and unjust? Why, then, shall I not endeavour to be happy, striving ever earnestly and hopefully to persuade those about me to walk by the light that gives peace and joy to my own soul—"struggling for the light," for the right and true, and endeavouring to draw others with me if I find the wished-for good. Such is my present resolve, such my earnest desire and prayer. Yet my heart turns longingly to Ohio—it grieves for it as a child for its mother, and tears unbidden will start when I think of the friends so loved, far away.

THE *Rhode Island Freeman* (a Free Soil journal), commenting upon the controversy between Phillips and Mann, drops this remark:

"The true history of the Anti-Slavery cause will record very many mistakes in policy on their [the Garrisonians'] part, among which will be their proscription of such an advocate as Mrs. Lydia Maria Child, and their ferocious assault upon Mr. Nathaniel P. Rogers, both of whom suffered severely for opinion sake from these very persons."

We copy the above for the purpose of denying its truth. So far as relates to Mrs. Child, the statement has no shadow of foundation, and it will probably surprise her as much as it will those who know how friendly she is to Mr. Garrison and his associates. As to N. P. Rogers, the only assault ever made upon him by the parties alluded to consisted in avowing their honest conviction that it was wrong to deprive the New Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society of its organ. For this they were bitterly assailed by Mr. Rogers, who, most unfortunately, fell a victim to the very illness which, by throwing his mind out of balance, led him to misunderstand and denounce his old friends, from whom, if his life had been spared, he could not have been permanently alienated.

THE HALE FESTIVAL.

Our Boston correspondent has furnished us an account of this Festival, from which it will be seen that Mr. Garrison was among the speakers. He was called up by the following sentiment, offered by C. M. Clay, Esq., of Kentucky:

The True Union—To Benton, to Bryant, to Seward, to Greeley, to Garrison, to Phillips, to Quincy—the union of *all* the opponents of the propaganda of Slavery.

Mr. Garrison being loudly called for, made a speech, which we find reported as follows in the *Commonwealth:*

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am happy to be with you on this occasion. Whatever may be our peculiar views as to the best measures to be adopted or the precise position to be occupied, one thing is true here—we are all "*Hale* fellows" (enthusiastic applause); and, what is better still, "*Hale* fellows well met" (continued cheers). It is not often that Anti-Slavery men are in a majority (applause). I believe we have it all our own way here this evening. It is not possible that there can be a single pro-slavery man or woman in this vast assembly: and I will prove it. Allow me to put it to vote. As many here as are in favour of the immediate and everlasting overthrow of Slavery, will please to say Aye! [An almost universal shout of affirmation went up]. As many as are opposed to the abolition of Slavery will say No! [A few voices replied 'No!' evidently through a misconception of the speaker's remarks]. Sir, it is as I thought it would be—*the Ayes have it* (cheers and laughter). And I hold that those who answered in the negative are bound, by their own rule of action, to come over to our side, and make the vote unanimous; for pro-slavery in our country always is looking to majorities, and to be on the popular side (laughter and cheers).

Our lion-hearted friend from Kentucky said that he had been called an infidel. Why, here he touched me "on the raw:"

"A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind."

I have also fallen under the same ban, and for the same reason. An infidel! Well, now, let me go to the good book—it shall be some evidence of my veneration for Christianity. In that book I find this injunction—"Credit to whom credit, honour to whom honour is due"—and I am here with you to-day, to carry out that precept, in regard to the distinguished guest of this occasion. "Credit to whom credit, honour to whom honour;" and how much credit and how much honour are due to him, you know, and the country and Christendom know. We are here to give him our heart's best aspirations, and to thank him for all that he has done, and nobly done, in his place in the United States Senate. Let us remember that he has never yet turned his back upon the enemy; that he has never hesitated to measure weapons with the strongest and proudest defenders of Slavery; and that he has met John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, and Daniel Webster, and never has been defeated or disgraced, but has come off, in the unbiassed judgment of the whole country, in every encounter victorious (loud cheers).

There are those in this community, I am sorry to say, who think we ought not to be here to-day; they think we ought not not to be eating our dinner (laughter). The deep complacency, the stern sense of propriety, the warm-hearted philanthropy of the Boston *Courier* has been deeply moved (renewed laughter). It has suggested the propriety of our going without our dinner, and paying the proceeds to emancipate some half-dozen slaves which that paper has advertised for sale (great laughter and cheers). Sir, our opponents are very hard to please. Strike where we will, we do not strike to their liking. If we do practice self-denial, and do fast, then they accuse us of being ascetics and fanatics; and if we eat our dinner, we have forgotten the slave! Well, sir, John came neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and they said, "He hath a devil." The Son of Man came both eating and drinking, and they said, "Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber" (loud cheers). So, in the ancient time, cavilled the chief priests, the scribes, and the pharisees; and their successors are saying the very same of us, at this day, in the same spirit (cheers). Of the former, Jesus said, "Ye are of your father the devil—hypocrites—a generation of vipers." All that we need do is to leave the latter in the same unerring judgment.

Sir, this is no idle coming together. It is not an empty eulogy which we are bestowing here to-day. We have come here to render a testimonial that shall be seen and felt throughout this country, and the echo of which shall go across the broad Atlantic, giving joy to the friends of equal liberty throughout Europe. So far from misapplying our means in a festival like this, I regard it as a wise expenditure for the cause. As I have looked at this august assembly, and listened to the stirring sentiments that have been uttered against the great sin of our country, my heart has leaped to think how many broken chains will be the result of it—how many burdens will be removed and captives set free, by this mighty magnetic demonstration.

Sir, I have recently been to the great West, as far as Cincinnati; and I am commissioned by the friends of the slave there to say to the friends of freedom in the East, that, at the West, there is not a despairing heart to be found (loud cheers). They have commissioned me to say, that they have taken hold, and they mean to hold on, and never to give up, until the system of Slavery is exterminated from the land (renewed cheers). Everywhere, the signs of the times are propitious. We have reason greatly to be encouraged. In proof of this, I have a letter from one whose name will be heard with delight by this great assembly—a man who has stood up in his place in Congress strong and stalwart, the bravest of the brave—Joshua R. Giddings (enthusiastic cheering). In this letter, dated Washington, Feb. 8th, addressed to my esteemed friend, Joseph A. Dugdale, of Pennsylvania, who is now present by my side (cheers), Mr. Giddings makes this cheering announcement:

"I am pleased to say that, from all the indications within my view, I regard our work of reform, in respect to Slavery, much further advanced than we have generally expected. In every quarter, I can see a change in the public going on; and in no places is the change more apparent than in this Hall and in the Senate. The tone and feeling is softening greatly, and *most Southern members now admit that Slavery never can be extended.* They find themselves contending against a moral feeling, of which they had but little conception" (loud cheering).

So much for the signs of the times at the West, at the seat of government, and in other parts of the country. Sir, in Cincinnati, I cast my eyes across the Ohio river into Kentucky, and, for the first time, saw Kentucky clay. To-day, I have not only seen, but *felt*, Kentucky Clay—*the* Clay of Kentucky (prolonged cheering). If every man in the Southern States were like this man, we should be here, celebrating the jubilee, instead of only measuring a stride onward in the grand march toward the goal of universal emancipation (loud applause).

Well, sir, though we are here in a majority in this hall, in our country we are yet in a fearful minority. There is a mighty work for us to do. Three millions two hundred thousand slaves are yet waiting for their deliverance; eighty thousand new victims are added to the capital stock every year; one additional slave is brought into being every eight minutes; and the Slave Power rules, with absolute sway, the religion and the politics of the whole land.

Sir, you will pardon me for the reference. I have heard something here about our Union, about the value of the Union, and the importance of preserving the Union. Gentlemen, if you have been so fortuate as to find a Union worth preserving, I heartily congratulate you. Cling to it with all your souls! For myself, I have not been so fortunate. With a price set upon my head by one of the Southern States of the Union—outlawed everywhere in the slaveholding South for my hatred of Slavery—you will pardon me if I am somewhat lacking in loyalty to the existing Union (laughter).

The Union! What is it? Where is it? Where, as the uncompromising friends of liberty, will you find protection under it? Gentlemen, look well to you language; use it intelligently and truly. The two great pro-slavery parties in the land join with you in glorfying this Union, and pledging to maintain it as a Slavery-sustaining compact. If you use the term "Union" in the political sense, then I ask how it happens that you who are pledged to give support to Slavery are thus in perfect agreement with those parties? If you do not, then I ask, where is the Union, and what do you mean by preserving it? Why are you not conscious of the fact, that in South Carolina, in Alabama, in any slave-holding State, this Anti-Slavery gathering would not be tolerated? We should all be deemed worthy of Lynch Law, and in all probability be subjected to a coat of tar and feathers! What a glorious Union it is that we are enjoying! How worthy of preservation!

Alas! the "Union" is but another name for the iron reign of the slave power. We have no common country, as yet. God grant we may have. We have no common Union, as yet. God grant we may have. We shall have it when the jubilee comes—and not till then. But now we are struggling against the overwhelming public sentiment of our country; we are small, numerically. O God, is it not a burning shame that there is not an inch of soil in all this land, whereon we can dare protect a fugitive slave! That the slave must skulk away, in sight of Bunker Hill and Faneuil Hall—that we must hide him by day, and get him out of the country by night! This must no longer be! Let us up, then, to our work, with new zeal and courage. In the language of one of the great poets of our cause:

"Gray Plymouth Rock hath yet a tongue, and Concord is not dumb,
And voices from our fathers' graves, and from the future, come:
They call on us to stand our ground—they charge us still to be
Not only free from chains ourselves, but foremost to *make* free!"

Correction.—Our friend Samuel May, Jr., is mistaken in stating, as he does in the last *Liberator*, that the American Bible Society sent out Rev. Drs. Spring and Parker, of this city, as associates of Rev. Samuel Ireneus Prime, to represent that Society at the Anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, soon to be held in London. Mr. May was probably led into this error by a hasty reading of a communication in the *Standard* of April 28. The two gentlemen named would, as our correspondent intimated, be fit associates of the *Observer* man in such a mission, but the Bible Society has not yet ventured to test the patience of the British public by administering so strong a pro-slavery dose.

Sallie Holley has been lecturing recently at Portland and Portsmouth, with signal success. Her eloquence rarely fails to produce a strong impression upon those who hear her.

Domestic Correspondence.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT.

NO. CXXV.

The Argument.—*The Constitutional Convention—The Death of Whiggery—Who killed it—Natural development of Patriotism—State of the Crops—Organization—Music and Codfish—The Correspondent on Codfish—His opinion of Salt-fish—Ichthyophagous prescription of New England—He defineth his position—The Hale Dinner—Where given—Comparison with the Thompson Supper—Malignancy and the Chaplain—Mr. Palfrey's Presidency—Mr. Hale's Reception—His Speech—Mr. Clay's ditto—He calls out Mr. Garrison—The Pioneer's Reception and Speech—Other Speeches and Conclusion—The Norwalk Murders—Possible Remedy, &c. &c. &c.*

Boston, May 9, 1853.

The Convention for revising the Constitution of Massachusetts met last week. It was the death-blow to Whiggery; or, rather, it was the funeral service held over its dead body. Nothwithstanding that the Whigs have had the control of the State ever since the beginning of the year, they had not been able to command the Convention. As soon as President Pierce was fairly out of the way and the Democrats could afford a single squint towards their own State, the prospect before them was too fair a one to be neglected. By uniting with the Free Soilers, they might get the control, jointly, of the new Constitution, and so establish a little home farm to which they might retire, in case the great homestead at Washington should be over-peopled. The first development of patriotism is, naturally, in the direction of our whole country. But in case the crop of Collectorships, Marshalships, Consulates, and other esculents, should fail, or not be sufficient for the mouths hungering for them, it is not a bad thing to have a little store of State offices in the Legislature, Shrievalties, Commissionerships, &c., laid up against a time of need. So the Democrats and the Free Soilers shook hands, and as they shook they tumbled poor rotten Whiggery down. The Convention came together, and the way in which the Whigs disappeared and were seen no more was, or might be, a caution to all political cripples. Mr. N. P. Banks, a Democrat, was chosen President, and a Free Soiler Secretary, by about a hundred majority. The great question, thus far, has been where its sessions shall be held. They have adjourned for to-day to the New Music Hall; in hopes, perhaps, of imbibing some of the harmony with which Sontag and Alboni have saturated its walls. But I believe they intend to hold the chief of their sessions under the shadow of the Old Codfish that predominates over the House of Representatives.

The Codfish was a symbol of New England prosperity of no small significance, within this century even. The Fisheries used to be thought one main prop of that prosperity, and was watched over with careful eyes. One way of encouraging the business was the establishment of an unwritten law that everybody should have salt-fish for dinner on Saturday. It would not do on Friday, you know, for that would savour of Popery; so Saturday was the day appointed by the prescription of New England for a Fish Day. It was very well for those that liked that saline aliment; but as I was not one of the number, I did not use to mark it with a Red Letter in my Calendar, on that account. As a holiday, it was very well. This custom continued till within thirty years of this day, and, I dare say, is not entirely extinct yet in some nooks and corners. But the growth of manufactures and trade, and other branches of business, have quite put the poor Cods' noses out of joint, and they are by no means such prominent members of Society as they used to be. But it was the space which they formerly occupied that gave rise to the graven image which hangs over the Speaker's Chair, or opposite to it; I forget which. But, as it is important to define one's position accurately in these coster-monger days, I wish it to be understood that every personal objection I have to Codfish only relates to it in its desiccated and salinous state. On the contrary, when I can get it *fresh*, I am, as Southey says of Cowper, "the most ichthyophagous of men." Let me not be misunderstood on this point.

The great event of the last week was the Dinner given by the Free Soilers to Mr. John P. Hale. Though given by them, we were given to understand that all who were desirous of showing Mr. Hale a mark of respect were invited to assist at it, so quite a number of Abolitionists took part in it; being very willing to express to Mr. Hale their sense of the brave manner in which he has behaved in the Senate, and of the admirable fidelity with which he gave himself to the Rescue Cases. The Dinner was given in the Hall over the Fitchburg Station, one of the largest rooms in the City, if not the very largest. The attendance was very large—the tables being full. The company amounted to about Fifteen hundred, about the same number that assisted at the Thompson Supper, and the effect was much the same. The only difference was in the size of rooms. The Hall in which we entertained Mr. Thompson not being quite as large as this, it was more compactly filled and more than filled, which added to its effect, and it was much lighter. Still here was the enlivening spectacle of fifteen hundred people met to eat their dinners in token of respect to a very good fellow. Grace was asked by the Rev. Mr. Stone, of Park Street Church, and there were some malignants present who thought the Free Soilers might have found a man to bless their meat other than one who had preached a Sermon on Daniel Webster, which Mr. Peter Harvey thought good enough to join in asking for a copy of it for the press. However, as I did not know who the Reverend Chaplain was, nor of this circumstance, until after the feast, my digestion was not at all impaired thereby.

The Hon. John G. Palfrey presided with the greatest possible grace and felicity. When he introduced Mr. Hale, the guest was received with the most tumultuous and enthusiastic shouts and waving of pocket-handkerchiefs and hats. He was obviously deeply affected by his reception, and spoke at first with strong emotion. His speech was a very excellent and appropriate one. Mr. Sumner followed him, and then came Mr. Cassius M. Clay, who was almost as much the lion of the occasion as Mr. Hale himself. He was received with a perfect tempest of applause and a fresh oblation of pocket-handkerchiefs. He spoke for about an hour, but I cannot, of course, give any idea of the Speeches, were it my business. After one or two other gentlemen had spoken, Mr. Clay asked leave to give another toast, in which he coupled together the extremest persons even showing hostility to Slavery, from Benton to Garrison, and hoping for union among them. Mr. Garrison, who was invited with the other Boston editors, was seated in the very thickest of the crowd in the centre of the floor. The moment his name was heard, a universal roar went up from the entire floor, calling for "Garrison! Garrison!" It was very plain that the regular proceedings could not go forward until he had been heard. At last, he rose and stood on the bench on which he had been sitting. As soon as his bald head emerged above the crowd, the greatest possible enthusiasm was evinced by the body of the meeting. As Kean said, "the house rose at him!" Cheer followed cheer, and were concluded by "three, altogether," called for from the extremity of the hall, "for the Pioneer!" which were given with a will. Mr. Garrison, as soon as he had a hearing, made a singularly felicitous and appropriate speech, in which he did justice to the success of the occasion, paid perhaps the justest compliments Mr. Hale received that day, and yet did not withhold his testimony to his own views of Anti-Slavery Duty. I believe it gave universal satisfaction, as it well might; both from its own merits and from the *fillip* which an unexpected occurrence like this always gives to a routine, however well arranged. Many other gentlemen spoke, whose order of speaking or whose speeches I have no occasion to record, for are they not written in the Book of the Chronicles of your own Herald? And a pretty good report it is, too, as far as I read it. The Meeting held together from two till nine, and then adjourned in great apparent contentment.

Every idea of a festive nature, however, was banished the next day by the frightful murders of Norwalk. Of all unprovoked and gratuitous wholesale homicides, that seems to have been the worst. A deep gloom spread itself over the City, and well it might. For, in a migratory population, like ours, there could scarcely be an individual in the City who had not some relative or personal friend who *might* very possibly be in that train. The agony of suspense must have been horrible in multitudes of cases, where no actual danger occurred. Will anything be done in consequence of this to protect the travelling public, which is but another name for the entire public, from fresh horrors of this sort? Will public justice wreak itself upon a poor wretch of an engineer, and be satisfied, or will it look to the guiltier parties who seek to save pence at the cost of invaluable lives. I think the remedy, or the preventive, proposed in the Connecticut Legislature the most feasible. It used to be a cant saying, expressive if not elegant, that "Corporations had no bodies to be kicked and no souls to be d—d." But they have a soul like that of the Le Sage's licentiate, in Gil Blas, which lies in their purse, and which may be reached. Let every Railway Corporation be compelled to pay $10,000 to the heirs of every person killed, and that not by the uncertain and tedious remedy of a suit at law; but by the sequestration of the Road by the State until the debt was paid, and it is the belief of one man, at least, that human life would rise at once to *par*, at least in the Stock Market.—D. Y.

[For the Standard.]

THE EXTRADITION OF FUGITIVE SLAVES.

[Continued from last number.]

I find the word *compact* in almost universal use as the definition of the American Constitution. It is regarded as the basis of the confederation of nationalities, previously distinct, into a single nation, and not only as the basis of the actual union, but as the only possible basis of union, its discovery a miracle of political inspiration. There lurk in these propositions grave errors, the foundation of graver errors. The Constitution of the United States is no more a compact than is the Constitution of New York, or the statute or common law. It did not furnish the ground of our nationality. The Americans were a unitary people from the first settlement of the country. They encountered far greater perils before the Constitution than have ever befallen them since its adoption. The union sentiment is probably less strong to-day than it was under the old confederation. If the American nationality had no other bond than the compacts and stipulations of log-rolling politicians, it would ere this have been dissevered. Distracted Statesmen rush together to heal the breaches in the Constitution, and paste the ruptured parchment, as though all the danger was there; they do not see that it is the change in the character and feelings of the people, one part advancing through freedom and culture to civilization, the other through Slavery and ignorance to barbarism, that is fast making two peoples of us. These distracted Statesmen not only do what they can to endanger the present union, but they do what they can to make any union chimerical and monstrous, by cherishing institutions, social customs and political opinions as hostile to, and incoherent with, American republicanism as Russian or Austrian despotism would be.

But I must not be drawn away from my proper argument. If the Constitution may be considered as a *compact*, and perhaps it, or any other paramount law, may be so considered, then the stipulations affecting persons held to service or labour may be illustrated thus:

Two neighbours occupy adjoining lands. Puritan is a farmer, and keeps all kinds of cattle. Cavalier is a gentleman, and keeps hunting horses and a pack of hounds for his pleasure. Meeting together, for the sake of comity and good neighbourhood they agree that certain customs and usages shall be mutually binding upon them. Among other matters regulated in their compact is that of straying cattle. Cavalier requires an express agreement on the part of Puritan that his hunting dogs escaping into his neighbour's premises shall not be trapped or shot, but delivered up to him. Puritan says he will enter into no such arrangement, neither your dogs nor my hogs shall be specified—besides, I do not wish in any way to express my approbation of your keeping dogs at all. We will have a general understanding, about straying cattle, and you are welcome to whatever security so innocent an arrangement can give you. Now if, in the process of years, Cavalier should add to the number of his hounds, until they became an army of depredators, the terror of Puritan's children, worrying his cattle and slaughtering his flocks, and if he, in self-defence, should poison or shoot all that came upon his grounds, is it pretended that he would not be at liberty, under the original agreement, to raise the question, whether or not *dogs* were *cattle?*

Again. It is a well settled principle of legal interpretation that a matter or thing must not only come *literally* within the terms of a certain definition, but that it must come *rightfully* within them. If an escaped slave can literally be considered a person held to service or labour, is he rightfully so? Fraud, violence, injustice, vitiate all. I think there are no exceptions to this rule. It is not enough that you have my note with my signature to it; you have no claim upon me, if I have paid it, or if you have forged my signature, or have compelled me to sign the note by threats. For the Northern Court or the Northern Commissioner, the question is: *held to service or labour*, or not *held to service or labour*. This question must be tried by his reason, his judgment, his conscience, his whole mind; everything at all relevant to the issue is applicable to the decision. If a man prefers a claim before him, that another man is held to his service or labour, he is to determine that simple question, not by the inspirations of fanaticism or the prescripts of the higher law, but by precisely the same principles he would apply in the decision of a controversy between two neighbours about a horse or a sheep. The difficulty in the slave claimant's way is intrinsic; it is incident to the utter preposterousness of his claim, which, not being founded in natural justice, finds insuperable difficulties in supporting itself upon legal foundations. To substantiate his claim that the escaped man is held to his service or labour, he offers to prove a series of outrages upon him, beginning with the theft of his person, running through a lifetime of robbery of his earnings, and ending with the crowning cruelty that compelled him to escape. If he goes into the heart of the matter, and does not stick in merely senseless words, he is bound to prove himself under infinite obligations to the man, the man under no obligations to him. Is it possible that, when the possession of a sheep accompanied with so many badges of fraud, would not confer a title for an instant, the *very fraud itself* can become the *gist* and *ground* of the title to a man? Can a man, because called upon to act in the capacity of a court, divest himself of his natural perceptions of justice, overlook the oldest principles of law, and swamp reason and conscience under such obvious absurdities?

If the rightfulness of holding to service or labour can be made no element in the discussion or decision, let the legitimate consequences of such a doctrine be considered. Rufus Choate comes down to Maine for a pleasure excursion and relaxation from professional cares. I seize him and make him my slave, and manage to hold him to my service or labour for a week, the laws of Maine furnishing me ample warranty therefor. At the end of the week he escapes to Boston and resumes his legal practice. Will Commissioner Curtis deliver him to me on my claim, with no investigation into the intrinsic legality of my title? The State of New York, to raise a fund to enlarge the Erie Canal, passes an act, by which all red-haired and bald-headed persons shall be sold into perpetual Slavery. Would these injured people, escaping to their own relatives in other States, be recoverable under the clause of the constitution, which is the topic of our present discussion? Virginia, taking the next downward step in barbarism, may perhaps add cannibalism to slave-breeding, and grow boys and girls, not for the *service* of the plantation, but for the *service* of the table. Should any of these escape into Pennsylvania from the slaughter, for which they had been fattened, must every good citizen of that State, on their oath to support the Constitution, lend a hand with alacrity to restore the poor victims to such a fate?

There must be a point beyond which legal sophistry cannot stretch this accommodating clause of the Constitution. It will not legalise every outrage which men may perpetrate on each other. If in any of the above problematical cases, coming as *literally* within the category of '*persons held to service or labour*' as did Thomas Sims, or Henry Long, the intrinsic injustice of the claim shows through the plausibility of forms and terms, does it not also in the case of every person preposterously claimed as a slave? An apprentice was delivered in New York lately to his master in New Jersey. Had it been apparent upon the very face of the proceedings that the master's purpose was to obtain possession of the person of the apprentice, to perpetrate upon him horrid and unnatural cruelties, would any magistrate, regardful of his oath, have ordered his delivery?

The slave claimant in his very demand, takes a position incompatible with any right under the Constitution. To prove a holding to service and labour, he sets up *ownership*, an irrelevant matter entirely. He sinks the *personality*, which is of the essence of the Constitutional description, and begins to talk of his estrayed *animal*. He is *ferus natura*, and he has derived title to him, by his labour in catching him in an African jungle, in taming him, and breaking him to work; or he is a domestic beast, the natural increase of the stock he bought in the cattle market or inherited from his father. Could anything to a mind capable of making distinctions, and applying fixed significance to language, be more utterly foreign to the simple relation of '*person held to service or labour*' than a claim of this nature?

But the escaped slave must not be discharged "*in consequence of any law or regulation in the State*" to which he escapes. Not at all. He shall have no immunity of this kind. He goes free, not by the force of any local law, but by the operation of the common law, the civil law, I had almost said human law—by the application to his case of principles, that would be recognised as authoritative in England, in Russia, and in South Carolina. There is not a court in a Southern State that would not soil its political integrity, and violate the recognised principles of jurisprudence, in decreeing that the stealing of a man conferred a title of ownership upon the thief. T.

[To be continued.]

The Baptists are erecting a new College at Fairfax, Franklin County, Vermont. A Professorship of Agriculture is to be established therein, with an endowment of $20,000.

Kidnapper Sentenced.—J. Anderson (coloured), convicted at January Sessions of kidnapping John McKinney from Maytown, was sentenced at Lancaster, on Monday to pay a fine of $1,000, pay costs of prosecution, and undergo solitary confinement in the County Prison, at hard labour, for nine years.—*Westchester (Pa.) Register.*

Western Cities.—Detroit numbers, says the *Tribune*, 30,000 souls. Cleveland numbers, on both sides of the Flats, 34,000. Buffalo and Chicago only exceed the Forest City in population, says the *Forest City*, of all the cities on the Lakes. In beauty or prosperity she has no superior on these northern inland seas.

At Bowling Green, O., Valentine Sage, in a fit of insanity caused by the excitement of a ten days' protracted meeting, killed one of his children and attempted to destroy his wife. He is now a raving maniac in Perrysburg Jail, but has a perfect knowledge of what he has done, and justifies the act on the ground that the child is now happy in Heaven.

A Stampede.—The "underground railroad" would seem to be in excellent order. A company of 29 slaves from Kentucky reached here on Monday evening last, and were safely conveyed to the Canada side the next morning. They were all hale young men and women, none of them over 35 years of age, for whose recapture, we hear, liberal offers are proclaimed. They travelled by wagons through Indiana, and reached here in good condition. They preferred to be their own property, and they deserved to be.—*Detroit Herald.*

Hon. N. P. Tallmadge has written to the *National Intelligencer*, avowing his faith in the spiritual rappings and other similar demonstrations. He says he has had frequent communications from Calhoun, Clay and Webster, which are characteristic of the men, and that those from Mr. Calhoun, "both in style and sentiment, are worthy of him in his palmiest days in the Senate."

A good joke, if true, is told by the correspondent of the New York *Times*, of Hawthorne, the author, and newly appointed Consul to Liverpool, who is at present in Washington, as follows:

In company with a friend, he met and was introduced to Mr. Eames, one of the editors of the *Union*, who, in his usually bland tone, expressed his gratification at making the acquaintance of a gentleman so distinguished in the literary world, and added, "By the way, Mr. Hawthorne, what is your last romance?"

Mr. H., who is an exceedingly nervous, wiry man, instantly replied, with great *naivete*, "The biography of General Pierce, sir?" The explosion of several vests in that vicinity, just then, apprised the jokers that they formed the centre of attraction to a not small crowd of amused spectators.

Kidnapping.—The Rhode Island *Freeman* states that some five or six years since, a coloured man of that city, who had paid eight hundred dollars for himself, went back to Maryland with the money in his hand to purchase his own wife. The master immediately raised the price two hundred dollars, and the man could not pay it. He came away sorrowful, but with the determination to have his wife or die in the attempt to possess her. He procured help in Providence, went back to his master's plantation, secreted himself until night, and then, with one faithful and confidential friend, crept to his wife's lodgings, *kidnapped* her, brought her safely to Providence: then bore her to Canada.

A Hanover County (Va.) correspondent of the Richmond *Dispatch*, under date 5th inst., writes: "I see from the Savannah *News* that the Georgia girls are felling trees and getting shingles. We have in this County two girls following the same occupation. I send you a sample of their workmanship. They get out six thousand per week by their own hands, at $4 50 per thousand. They supply the whole demand in that region of country, and many are sold in the Richmond market. They have, by dint of industry, purchased an excellent piano. They are most excellent performers. Their task is six thousand per week. They shorten their task by working at night in the fishing season, thereby gaining Saturday, which they devote to pleasure. They go to the Pamunky River and haul the seine, regardless of the depth of water. They can dive deeper, stay under longer, and come out dryer, than any other girls in the United States. Now, let the Georgia girls cut and come again."

Clerical Bereavement.—The papers are reporting the story that on the night of the 2d inst., a lot of negroes, twenty-five in number, ran away from their owners in Boone County, Kentucky, and what is most shocking to relate, among those thus suddenly bereft of their property are two *ministers of the Gospel.* Think of that! What benighted heathen those slaves must have been, to absolutely run out from under the droppings of the sanctuary! The editor of the *Banner*, published at Aurora, gives us the "Key" to this unparalleled proceeding by saying that some weeks previous to their departure, one of the slaves procured and read to his comrades, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and it is supposed that the beauties of Canadian freedom, as pictured by Mrs. Stowe, were the inducements to run away. Really, what a state of things are we coming to, when a single copy of an "exaggerated fiction" can overturn all the pious counsels of a couple of the Ministers of the Gospel!

Good Prices.—Capers and Hayward sold yesterday, at their sales-room, Adger's wharf, a Blacksmith for $1,455; a Bricklayer for $1,130; and a single female slave for $790.—*Charleston Mercury.*

Bad prices, we should say. When, to obtain the "raw material" for labour, such investments of capital are necessary, the prices are bad. Plenty of white female servants can be had here—not *owned*, however—without any $750 at all. No country can flourish under such prices, not for labour, but for the opportunity or privilege to use what can be got for the men and women that can develop it.—*New York Express.*

What means this renewal of "agitation?" And by the New York *Express*, a journal that the Castle Garden Safety Committee paid for "setting up" with the Union!

Such a paragraph, six months ago, in the Evening Journal, would have been seized upon by the *Express* as conclusive evidence of a design to dissolve the Union.

What—we repeat the question—does all this mean? Have the Cotton folks stopped payment? Or is the *Express* on another political attack?—*Albany Evening Journal.*

The Constitutional Convention of Delaware, which recently adjourned, among other alterations and amendments proposed of and to the Constitution of that State, took the following action on the subject of the emancipation of slaves. Hon. James A. Bayard, United States Senator, introduced amendments which provide that hereafter the Legislature shall have no authority to emancipate slaves without the owner's consent: that no free negro or mulatto shall hereafter settle in the State, nor shall those who leave the State, with intent to change their residence, ever settle in it again, nor shall either of these classes remain in it for more than ten days: all contracts made with them shall be void, and those who employ them, or encourage them to remain, shall be fined not less than ten nor more than five hundred dollars, the fines to be appropriated to the colonisation of such free negroes and mulattoes who shall be inhabitants of the State at the time of the adoption of the new Constitution, and who may be willing to emigrate.

The acceptance or rejection of this Constitution is to be decided, by popular vote, on the second Tuesday in October next, and, if accepted, the first election under it will take place in November of next year. As one of the amendments proposed allows each county to choose three Senators, it is thought that Newcastle, which contains one-half of the free population of Delaware, and to whom this feature is obnoxious, will oppose and defeat its adoption.

Colourphobia.—We have just heard of a case of colourphobia in this State, which we will relate as briefly as possible. It is that of an old negro, who has for a quarter of a century been a consistent member of the Congregational Church of the town in which he resides. No one ever complained of his deportment. He is always neat and clean, and is always to be found at his place at church. But the negro is very old, and unusual sorrows and cares have shattered his frame. About a year ago, his wife died. Before her death, the couple were in the habit of climbing the stairs to sit in the gallery—to humour the prejudice of the very pious and respectable audience. After his wife's death, the negro, being old and feeble, ventured to sit below, in the body of the church, with his Christian brethren. He was allowed to sit there for several months, but at last the colourphobia set in, and many of the good Christians present became dissatisfied with the presence of a 'nigger.' The Society's Committee instructed the Sexton to inform said 'nigger' that he could no longer sit below in the church, and he was compelled to stay at home. A short time after, at the annual meeting for the sale of slips, some white friend of his rented one for his (negro's) use, but when his object was ascertained, a violent attempt was made to pass a resolution denying any man the right to introduce a negro into his own slip! This failed, and the negro took his seat at church again. But there were some of the white Christians who were filled with the colourphobia, and would not be contented, and they warned a Society's Meeting. The meeting (said to be illegal from the fact that the business was not specified) was not fully attended, but a resolution was passed appointing a committee to inform the negro that he could no longer sit below in that church, *save while the Communion was being administered!* One half of the men who voted for this barbarous resolution were brother church members of the negro. The Committee waited upon the old man, and he burst into tears when their cruel errand was made known. His heart was almost broken to think that in the midst of his old age, his infirmities and his afflictions, his *brothers in Christ* should attempt to eject him from the Lord's Temple, and he has never since attempted to sit with them. The church is now quiet again, and can go on singing hallelujahs to the Lord, without the unpleasant presence of the 'nigger!' Its members can shout and pray with special delight, for the old meeting-house contains only *white* faces! But it contains some black *souls;* and they will *look* black, too, at the trial-day of the universe, by the side of the pious, humble negro's spirit! Do they suppose that *there* they can vote the negro away, off into some gallery-pew? Will they *dare*—in the presence of the great God—apologise for their hatred of the negro? Dare make the excuse for their cruel persecution; that *he was black?* It were better for them that a mill-stone were hanged about their necks, and that they were cast into the sea.

We had supposed that the day for 'Jim Crow cars' and 'negro pews' was over in New England, but it seems we were mistaken. The monied corporations, though reputed to be soulless, have still a glimmering sense of right, and have got over their colourphobia, but there are *Christian churches* yet which have not. The railroads are ahead of the churches in decency—the steam-engines in advance of the deacons! Let us live in hope. If the divinity that is dealt out from New England pulpits will not root out this wicked prejudice against *a colour*, perhaps that of the ledger *will.*—*Hartford Republican.*

Receipts for the Standard.

From April 1st, to May 1st, 1853.

733	David Irish, Quaker Hill, N. Y.	$2 00
676	J. A. Ward, Buffalo, "	1 00
711	E. Ann Peet, Farmersville, "	2 00
663	Rowland Johnson, New York City,	2 00
698	P. Sherman, Milton, N. Y.	2 00
624	Y. Stanley, Windendon, Mass.	1 92
624	Isaac Newhall, Lynn, Mass.	8 00
735	Job Frever, Lockport, N. Y.	2 00
629	Sturgis Goodsell, Brookfield, Ct.	3 00
664	E. D. Pason, Salem, Mass.	3 00
676	Charles A. Wheelock, Uxbridge, Mass.	3 85
713	Samuel A. Green, W. Winfield, N. Y.	2 00
781	Judge Emerson, New York City,	2 00
712	S. Howland, Red Creek, N. Y.	2 00
739	Robert Johnson, New York City,	1 50
676	Mary A. Cutter, Holliston, Mass.	6 00
635	Bull & Fay, Upton, Mass.	5 00
469	Sydney Alcott, Manchester, Ct.	2 00
754	George T. Cook, Boston, Mass.	2 00
702	Hamilton Hill, Oberlin, Ohio,	6 23
676	Joseph Congdon, New Bedford, Mass.	2 00
		$60 50

FROM SUBSCRIBERS IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

Dublin A. S. Society,	$3 00
Dublin Ladies A. S. Society,	3 00
John B. Estlin, Bristol, Eng.	3 00
Miss Whitelegge, Manchester, Eng.	2 50
Bristol & Clifton Ladies A. S. Society,	3 00
W. E. Forster, England,	3 00
Richard Allen, Dublin,	3 00
	$20 50

DONATIONS.

Joseph Carpenter, New Rochelle,	$5 00

COLLECTION FOR AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY BY G. B. STEBBINS.

J. Lawrence, Walworth, N. Y.	1 00
R. R. Richmond, "	1 00
Vestie Richmond, "	0 50
Mr. Findlay, "	0 50
Collected, "	0 75
Egypt, "	0 50
Peterboro' "	3 64
Georgetown, "	2 00
Lebanon, "	1 25
C. B. Wade, Williamson,	0 50
Collection, Easton,	1 37
J. Peckham, "	0 50
F. Tobey, North Easton,	1 00
S. & J. Wilbur, North Easton,	5 00
Collection, Union Village,	2 90
	$22 41

RECAPITULATION.

Receipts for Standard,	$60 50
From Subscribers in England and Ireland,	20 50
Donations,	5 00
Collection by G. B. Stebbins,	22 41
Total,	$108 41

Call for a General Religious Conference,

WITH A VIEW TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A YEARLY MEETING IN PENNSYLVANIA.

The various religious denominations of the land are arrayed against the progressive spirit of the age, and by their very structure, assumptions and regulations, cannot occupy a co-operative position, because they impose fetters upon freedom of speech and of coscience, by requiring a slavish conformity in matters of abstract faith and sectarian discipline. This has led and is leading to extensive secessions from such organizations in all parts of the country, leaving the seceders generally in a scattered and isolated condition, whose talents, influence and means might be profitably concentrated for the advancement of the world-embracing cause of Human Brotherhood, and who are yearning for some form of association at once simple, free and attractive.

The abuse of a good thing is not a reason for its utter rejection; and organization, in itself considered, is not only proper, but may be rendered powerfully efficacious as an instrument in the hand of Reform, without impairing the liberty, detracting from the independence, or limiting the conscience of any individual; though, from the nature of things, its perpetuation is not to be expected or desired, but it is at all times to be regarded as a means to an end, and to be discarded whenever it becomes an impediment to the progress of truth.

The Society of Friends has been a theatre of agitation for years, growing out of ecclesiastical domination on the one hand, and the demand for practical righteousness on the other; a domination entirely at variance with the spirit of primitive Quakerism, seeking to suppress free thought, and to exclude from membership those whose lives are without blemish, whose example in word and deed is a burning and shining light, and who are seeking to know and do the will of God, at whatever sacrifice; a domination which has been deemed so intolerable, that in the States of New York, Ohio and Michigan, Yearly Meetings have been formed, two of which have taken the name of Congregational Friends, and two others that of Progressive Friends, and which invite to membership 'all those who look to God as a Universal Father, and who regard as one Brotherhood the whole family of man.'

In view of facts like these, and believing there is an extensive preparation of mind for such a movement, we cordially invite not only the members of the Society of Friends, but all those who feel the want of social and religious co-operation, and believe that a Society may be formed, recognising the *Progressive Element* which will divorce Religion from *technical theology*, to meet with us in General Conference, at Friends' meeting house at Old Kennett, in Chester County, Pennsylvania, on First day, the 22d of Fifth month, 1853, at half-past 11 o'clock, A. M., to deliberate upon such plan of organization as may commend itself to the judgment of those assembled, and to take action upon such other subjects pertaining to Human Duty and Welfare, as may appear to demand the attention of the assembly.

Amos Preston,	James Fulton,
Jonathan Lamborn,	Ann Fulton,
Moses Pennock,	Enoch S. Hannum,
Mary J. Pennock,	Enoch L. Taylor,
Benjamin Pyle,	Alice Eliza Hambleton,
Esther Hayes,	James Truman,
Castner Hanway,	Mary A. Truman,
Sumner Stebbins,	Simon Barnard,
Hannah Cox,	Sarah D. Barnard,
Jesse Pennock,	James Painter,
Hannah M. Darlington,	Esther Moore,
Oliver Johnson,	Ebenezer James,
James Meredith,	Rebecca L. Fussell,
Sarah B. Dugdale,	Ephraim Wilson,
William Barnard,	George Chapman,
Joseph A. Dugdale,	Richard Janney,
Eusebius Barnard,	Cyrus M. Burleigh,
Isaac Meredith,	Robert Purvis,
Thamazin Meredith,	Harriet Purvis,
Isaac Mendenhall,	Elijah F. Pennypacker,
Dinah Mendenhall,	Jacob L. Paxson,
Vincent Barnard,	Barclay Ivins,
Benjamin Kent,	Fannie Schofield,
Thomas Borton,	Mahlon B. Linton,
Beulah Borton,	Thomas Garrett,
Bartholomew Fussell,	Edward Webb,
Rebecca Fussell,	Rowland Johnson,
Ann Coates,	Henrietta Wallcott Johnson.

The Proviso Wanting.—We learn from the correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun*, that the new territory of Washington, so fertile and salubrious, and so inviting to agricultural enterprise, is opened, by the liberality of Congress, for the reception of Southern immigrants with their slaves. A considerable number of citizens of Missouri and Kentucky, and probably Virginia, will avail themselves of the boon and of the opportunity thus unexpectedly afforded for the introduction of another great slave State into the Union.

If we were assured of the truth of the above, we might have some comments to make. We can hardly credit the relation.

NEW BOOKS,

Of Rare Interest and Value,

JUST PUBLISHED BY

JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY,

BOSTON.

Owing to the unparalleled draft upon our resources, during the past year, on account of the unexampled sale of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' a large number of most valuable manuscripts were obliged to be untouched in our safe, waiting a favourable moment to appear in print. We have availed ourselves of the earliest moment, and now offer them to the *readers of good books.* Most of them are issued. Those still in press will be published speedily.

The Silent Land;

Or, Leaves or Consolation for the Afflicted,

BY MRS. H. DWIGHT WILLIAMS.

This volume is a compilation from the best prose writers and poets of America and England, of their most beautiful pieces, for the solace of those who mourn the loss of near and dear friends. Price, $1.

The Shady Side;

Or, Life in a Country Parsonage,

BY A PASTOR'S WIFE.

This volume is designed, in a measure, as a contrast to that charming little book, 'Sunny Side,' and we doubt not that it will meet with quite as favourable a reception as that work. It is written in an admirable style, and he who commences its perusal will hardly be able to stop until he has gone through. Price, 75 cents.

Count Struenzee the Skeptic and the Christian.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY MRS. WILSON.

This most interesting work contains the history of the last days of this distinguished man, and the account of his numerous interviews and conversations with his pastor, Muntor, through whose instrumentality he was led to abandon his skepticism, and embrace the religion of Jesus. Price, 62½ cents.

The Last Hours of Christ;

BY W. G. SCHAUFFLER,

Missionary at Constantinople.

A portion of this most admirably written volume of Meditations on the last hours of our Saviour upon earth was published some years since, and met with great favour from the religious public. The work has been re-written, and very much enlarged, and is again offered to the community. We would not say a word in its commendation to those who have read the volume as originally published. To those who love to go with the Redeemer of men, to meditate in the garden of Gethsemane, or upon the mount of Olives, or by the sea of Galilee, this volume will afford a vein of sacred thought. Price, $1.

Dr. Beecher's Third Volume.

We have just issued the third volume in the series of the writings of this venerable and eloquent man, as has been lately said of him by some one, 'the father of more brains than any other man in the country.' This volume contains his View of Theology, and his celebrated Trial for Heresy, before the Presbytery and Synod of Cincinnati, with a superb steel Portrait, by Andrews. Price, $1. No Clergyman's library is complete without Dr. Beecher's writings.

White Slavery in the Barbary States.

BY HON. CHARLES SUMNER, U. S. S.

Illustrated with 50 superb designs by Billings, engraved by Baker, Smith & Andrews. Price, 50 cents.

This superb volume in its typography and illustrations, and elegant in its composition, being one of the finest productions of its accomplished author, is offered to the public in this most attractive form, with the hope that thousands may peruse its glowing pages, and from them receive fresh stimulus in their efforts to elevate humanity from degradation and wrong. They will learn from it that, in years past, *White men* as well as Blacks have felt the galling yoke of Slavery.

Philosophy Of Mysterious Rappings,

Or, the Dynamic Laws and Relations of Man,

BY DR. E. C. ROGERS.

A learned and philosophical exposure of the modern belief in spiritual manifestations, showing, most conclusively, that we need not go to the spirit world to account for those things, but that they can all be explained by human agency, and upon philosophical principles. Let the believers in spiritual rappings read this able and conclusive work. Price, $1.

The Trial by Jury,

BY LYSANDER SPOONER.

We need not inform the public that any work from Mr. Spooner's pen would be one of great research and learning—his logical acuteness as a writer is too well known. This, his last, and perhaps his greatest, effort, on the Trial by Jury, is destined to create a commotion in the world. Jurymen will learn their rights and duties from it, and also learn to what an alarming extent their rights have been encroached upon. We bespeak for this able treatise a candid perusal. Price, $1 25 in cloth; $1 50 in law sheep.

German Uncle Tom,

TRANSLATED BY PROFESSOR HUTTEN.

In one volume octavo. Price, 50 cents.

The English language has been exhausted in praise of this unrivalled tale; and this translation into the German language we believe will be as popular among the large German population in this country.

Book of 1000 Anecdotes,

Humorous, Grave and Witty,

BY M. LAFAYETTE BRYN, M. D.

There are hours when men need relaxation from the sterner labours of life, both bodily and mental. In these seasons, such a volume as the above is a desirable companion, and affords that relief which the mind needs. Price, $1.

In Press, to be issued speedily,

A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin,

BY MRS. H. B. STOWE.

A work which will most thoroughly establish the truth of every statement in 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' and a good many *not* in that work. Price, 50 cents.

Giddings' Speeches.

The Congressional speeches of this distinguished and uncompromising Anti-Slavery veteran, who is still battling nobly with the powers of darkness, complete in one volume, 12mo., with a Portrait. Price, $1.

The Writings of Judge Jay,

On the Slavery Question.

Now first collected. An invaluable volume. Price, $1. Ready in April.

Key to Uncle Tom, in German.

This work is now being translated into German, by one of our best German scholars, and will be issued soon after the publication of the English edition.

Writings of Prof. Bela B. Edwards, D. D.

BY REV. PROF. PARK, D. D.

With a Memoir, by Dr. Park.

This work, which has been unavoidably delayed, will be issued in two volumes, 12mo., about the 1st of April.

The numerous admirers of Dr. Edwards will hail with pleasure this announcement. The collected writings of such a man are an invaluable contribution to our literature, more particularly when compiled by so ripe a scholar as Dr. Park. The Memoir glows with all the fervid enthusiasm of the Editor.

Complete Encyclopædia of Music,

BY JOHN W. MOORE,

Assisted by John S. Dwight, Esq., the learned and accomplished Editor of 'The Journal of Music.'

This work will occupy an unoccupied field, no such work ever having been compiled before, either in this country or in England. It will be a complete Dictionary of all Musical Terms, a History of the Science of Music, from the earliest times to the present; a Treatise on Harmony and Thorough Bass; a Description of all known Musical Instruments, and a complete Musical Biography, containing a succinct memoir of more than 3,000 of the most distinguished musical celebrities and composers, in one large royal 8vo. volume, of about 1,000 pages, double columns. To be issued during the summer.

The above valuable works are published by

JOHN P. JEWETT & CO., Boston.

JEWETT, PROCTOR & WORTHINGTON, Cleveland, Ohio.

And for sale by Booksellers generally.

Boston, March, 1853. 2m

Female Medical College of Pennsylvania.

FOTRTH ANNUAL SESSION.

The next session of this Institution will commence on September 1st, 1853, and continue *five months*, closing on the 31st of January, 1854.

Persons wishing copies of the announcement or desirous of obtaining further information, will please apply personally, or by letter to the Dean of the Faculty.

David J. Johnson, M. D., 229 Arch st. Philadelphia.

March 3d—tf

Writings of W. L. Garrison.

Selections from the "Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison"—316 pages, duodecimo. Price—In cloth, $1; extra gilt, $1.25.

For sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, 142 Nassau st., N. Y.

The Liberty Bell for 1853.

For SALE AT THIS OFFICE. Price: gilt, $1,25; plain, 75 cents.

Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Mrs. Stowe's new work, The Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin, for sale at this office.

In paper covers.....50 cents. | Bound..........75 cents

Miscellaneous Department.

THE NEW "SHAKSPEARE."*

It has not been the good fortune of the great English Dramatist, as far as text and commentary have been concerned, to be read (as Coleridge complimented Kean) by flashes of lightning. The Shakspearian world, glorious in stream and landscape, in hill and bosky dell, may be truly said to have lain in comparative darkness; pierced here and there by a ray of light shot down from some critical eye: the beauty and sublimity of the magnificent Cosmos was visible rather by its own light, and has glimmered for many generations up through the verbal emendation and ponderous commentary. Not that we, or any ungrateful man, would venture to deny the skill, the learning, the patient wisdom and sagacity which have, in so many cases, developed the true letter, accordant to the spirit of the Creator himself. They have toiled in platoons, for a couple of centuries, dictionary under the arm and stylus in hand, over hill and dale, to attain the true meanings of the oracles. The prophets have been many, and their sage givings-out have been accepted by the public—in the absence of any better evidence of direct inspiration. An end has at length come to their craft: and by an accident late in the day, and entirely unforseen. It was supposed that time, the old sybil, weary of the business, had burned all his books, and that no more of these oracular folios was to be had for love or money. The history of this extraordinary windfall, the discovery and possession of the annotated folio of 1632, must be given by Mr. Collier himself:

"In the spring of 1849 I happened to be in the shop of the late Mr. Rodd, of Great Newport street, at the time when a package of books arrived from the country: my impression is that it came from Berfordshire, but I am not at all certain upon a point which I looked upon as a matter of no importance. He opened the parcel in my presence, as he had often done before in the course of my thirty or forty years' acquaintance with him, and, looking at the backs and title-pages of several volumes, I saw that they were chiefly works of little interest to me. Two folios, however, attracted my attention, one of them gilt on the sides, and the other in rough calf: the first was an excellent copy of Florio's 'New World of Words,' 1611, with the name of Henry Osborn (whom I mistook at the moment for his celebrated namesake, Francis), upon the first leaf; and the other a copy of the second folio of Shakspeare's Plays, much cropped, the covers old and greasy, and, as I saw at a glance on opening them, imperfect at the beginning and end. Concluding hastily that the latter would complete another poor copy of the second folio, which I had bought of the same bookseller, and which I had had for some years in my possession, and wanting the former for my use, I bought them both, the Florio for twelve and the Shakspeare for thirty shillings.

"As it turned out, I at first repented my bargain as regarded the Shakspeare, because, when I took it home, it appeared that two leaves which I wanted were unfit for my purpose, not merely by being too short, but damaged and defaced; thus disappointed, I threw it by, and did not see it again, until I made a selection of books I would take with me on quitting London. In the meantime, finding that I could not readily remedy the deficiencies in my other copy of the folio, 1632, I had parted with it; and when I removed into the country, with my family, in the spring of 1850, in order that I might not be without some copy of the second folio for the purpose of reference, I took with me that which is the foundation of the present work.

"It was while putting my books together for removal, that I first observed some marks in the margin of this folio; but it was subsequently placed upon an upper shelf, and I did not take it down until I had occasion to consult it. It then struck me that Thomas Perkins, whose name, with the addition of 'his Booke,' was upon the cover, might be the old actor who had performed in Marlowe's 'Jew of Malta,' on its revival shortly before 1638. At this time I fancied that the binding was of about that date, and that the volume might have been his; but in the first place I found that his name was Richard Perkins, and in the next I became satisfied that the rough calf was not the original binding. Still, Thomas Perkins might have been a descendant of Richard; and this circumstance and others induced me to examine the volume more particularly; I then discovered, to my surprise, that there was hardly a page which did not present, in a hand-writing of the time, some emendations in the pointing or in the text, while on most of them they were frequent, and on many numerous.

"Of course I now submitted the folio to a most careful scrutiny; and, as it occupied a considerable time to complete the inspection, how much more must it have consumed to make the alterations? The ink was of various shades, differing sometimes on the same page, and I was once disposed to think that two distinct hands had been employed upon them; this notion I have since abandoned; and I am now decidedly of opinion that the same writing prevails from beginning to end, but that the amendments must have been introduced from time to time, during, perhaps, the course of several years. The changes in punctuation alone, always made with nicety and patience, must have required a long period, considering their number; the other alterations, sometimes most minute, extending even to turned letters and typographical trifles of that kind, from their very nature could not have been introduced with rapidity, while many of the errata must have severely tasked the industry of the old corrector.

"Then comes the question why any of them were made, and why such extraordinary pains were bestowed on this particular copy of the folio, 1632?"

The value of this edition rests in the first place upon its origin, and the authority of its corrector and emendator, and secondly upon the merit of the emendations themselves. As to the latter point, our particular examination of the changes introduced in the text by this folio of 1632, hereafter will show specifically their worth: to present Mr. Collier's view of the first fully and fairly, we must again employ his own language:

"If there be one point more clear than another, in connexion with the text of Shakspeare as it has come down to us, it is that the person, or persons, who prepared the transcripts of the plays for the printer, wrote by the ear, and not by the eye: they heard the dialogue, and wrote it down as it struck them. This position has been completely established by Malone; and only in this way can we explain many of the whimsical mistakes in the quartos and folios. It is very well known that associations of actors, who bought dramas of their authors, were at all times extremely averse to the publication of them, partly under the persuasion that the number of readers would diminish the number of auditors. The managers and sharers did their utmost to prevent the appearance of plays in print; and it is the surreptitious manner in which pieces got out to the public that will account for the especial imperfectness, in respect to typography, of this department of our early literature. About half the productions of Shakspeare remained in manuscript until seven years after his death: not a few of those which were printed in his life-time were shamefully disfigured, and not one can be pointed out to the publication of which he in any way contributed. When he finally retired to Stratford-upon-Avon, we cannot find that he took the slightest interest in works which had delighted living thousands, and were destined to be the admiration of unborn millions: he considered them the property of the theatre for which they had been written, and doubtless conceived that they were beyond his control.

"If, therefore, popular dramas did make their way to the press, it was generally accomplished either by the employment of short-hand writers, who perfectly took down the words as they distinctly heard them, or by the connivance and aid of inferior performers, who, being 'hirelings' at weekly wages, had no direct interest in the receipts at the doors. They may have furnished the booksellers with such parts as they sustained, or could in any way procure from the theatre; and it is not unlikely that, listening as they must have daily done, to the repetions of the principal actors, they would be able to recite, with more or less accuracy, whole speeches, and even scenes, which a little ingenuity could combine into a drama. We may readily imagine, that what these inferior performers had thus got by heart, they might dictate to some mechanical copyist, and thus many words, and even sentences, which sounded like something else, would be misrepresented in the printed editions, and nobody take the pains to correct the blunders. Of course, those who were sharers in theatres would be the last to remedy defects; and in this way oral representations on our early stages, by the chief actors, might easily be more correct than the published copies of performances.

"Upon this supposition we must account for not a few of the remarkable manuscript emendations in my folio, 1632: the annotator of that volume may have been connected with one of our old play-houses; he may have been a manager, or a member of a company; and, as an admirer of Shakspeare, as well as for his own theatricl purposes, he may have taken the trouble, from time to time, to set right errors in the printed text by the more faithful delivery of their parts by the principal actors. This might have been accomplished by him as a mere spectator, and he may have employed the edition nearest his own day as the receptacle of his notes; he may, however, have been aided by the prompt-books; and the whole appearance of our volume seems to afford evidence that the work of correction was not done speedily, nor continuously, but as the misprints became apparent, and the means of correcting them occurred. Thus a long interval may have elapsed before this copy of the second folio was brought to the state in which it has reached us."

These points are well taken, and with a judgment which characterizes all of the Shakespearian labors of the distinguished editor; but will they satisfactorily explain and account for 20,000 emendations? Would any person of any class pointed at here be sufficient to all these improvements? Would it be a person "connected with one of our old play-houses?" a manager? a member of a company? an admirer of Shakspeare? or a mere spectator? Was it by any one of these that all of these remarkable expositions and changes has been made? A single example will happily show the quality and value of the emmendations in the folio of 1632: it is a principal note on "The Tempest":

"An important and curious point is settled by a manuscript stage-direction opposite the words used by Prospero in the commencement of his third speech on this page—

'Now I arise.'

"What is written in the margin of the corrected folio, 1632, is, *Put on robe again*; and the full force of this addition may not at first be obvious. It refers back to an earlier part of the same scene (p. 12), where Prospero says to Miranda—

'Lend thy hand,
And pluck my magic garment from me.—So:
Lie there my art.'

"The words *Lay it down* are written against this passage, as *Put on robe again* are written against 'Now I arise.' The fact is that Prospero, having put off his 'magic garment,' never put it on again, according to all existing copies of the drama; and it was this singular omission that the manuscript-corrector of the folio, 1632, supplied. The great propriety of Prospero's removal of his robe of power, during his narration to his daughter, is evident; he did not then require its aid; but just before he concluded, and just before he was to produce somnolency in Miranda, by the exercise of preternatural influence, he resumed it, a circumstance by which the judgment and skill of the poet are remarkably illustrated. Annotators have endeavoured to account for the sudden disposition of Miranda to sleep, in spite of her interest in her father's story, in various ways; but the effect upon her, by the resumption of his 'magic garment' by Prospero, has escaped observation, because every editor, from the first to the last, seems to have forgotten that Prospero, having laid aside his outer dress near the beginning of the scene, ought to put it on again, at all events, before the end of it. When, therefore, he says, 'Now I arise,' he does not mean, as Steevens absurdly supposed, 'Now my story heightens,' because the very reverse is the fact; but that he rose from the seat he had taken, in order to invest himself again in his 'magic garment,' having occasion to use it now in producing sudden drowsiness on Miranda. The manuscript-corrector of the folio, 1632, has previously pointed out what nobody else ever noted, viz., the precise moment when, of old, the actor of the part of Prospero took his seat, by writing *Sit down* opposite the following lines (p 13) with which the magician commences his narrative:

'The hour's now come,
The very minute bids thee ope thine ear;
Obey, and be attentive.' [*Sit down.*

"Having here taken his seat, we may conclude that he continued to occupy it until he uttered 'Now I arise.' Miranda, who stood eagerly listening by his side, then sat down on her turn: her father, clothed again in his 'magic garment,' enjoins her to 'sit still;' and not long afterwards we come to the manuscript stage direction, *She sleeps*—an effect wrought upon her senses, not by any physicial weariness, but by the agency of Prospero, empowered by that robe with which he had only recently re-invested himself for the purpose. Thus we see the value of apparently trifling stage directions in explaining so singular an incident as the sudden and deep slumber of Miranda, at the moment when Prospero had concluded his surprising and exciting story."

To achieve the substance of the improvements here described, would require direct contact with the stage, a complete knowledge and understanding of the text, and, it seems to us, a thorough privacy with the author's intent. Who possessed all these—not only, as regards this single passage in "The Tempest," affecting a stage direction—but ranging over the entire thirty-six plays with equal minuteness, accuracy, and judgment? Who was it so thoroughly master of these and other necessary conditions, able to punctuate, amend, abridge, expand, substitute, revise, comment, expound, and thoroughly edit Shakespeare, at that early period.

There was but one man in all England, who could at any time have met the requirements of the case, with fulness of knowledge, practical acquaintance with the stage performance, and a power and capacity of explanation equal to the demand—so various, so special, and so satisfying—of these twenty-thousand changes. Shakspeare himself: and it is our belief, after a careful examination of this valuable supplementary volume of Mr. Collier's, that it is to Shakspeare's mind, though not to Shakspeare's hand, that we are indebted for this valuable edition of the dramas of Shakespeare. Upon this conviction we shall speak more fully in a second paper, explaining the grounds of our belief; and, advancing through the volume, with this lamp in our hand, we shall, by its light, classify these important emendations, showing in what spirit they are made, their value, and their variety, and testing how far they are worthy to be incorporated in the body, and to form a part of the living spirit, of that Shakspeare which is to be known to all future generations who employ the English tongue.—*The Literary World.*

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

We propose, before an attempt to enforce the conviction which we have as to the origin and authority of the emendations in Mr. Collier's annotated folio, to place our readers in possession of a sufficient number of the more important, to be able to keep us company in the conclusion on which we propose to insist. By way of preface, we may state, that the course which a play takes on its way to the stage, is something in this order (and we have no reason to doubt but that Shakspeare's followed the ordinary course). The play is written; it has more or less of alteration by the author himself before it is submitted to the managers and actors; other changes are then likely to be introduced, some affecting the general action of the piece and the arrangement and distribution of the scenes, others the language as regards length of passages, convenience for elocutionary delivery, and the capacity of the immediate performers. A copy is prepared, by the prompter or copyist, of the entire play; the separate parts are written out for each actor, with the proper "cues," as they are technically called; that is, half lines of the previous character to suggest what follows; and the play is put in rehearsal. Other changes in all the points to which we have referred, may now be introduced—suggested by the working of the piece on this preliminary trial. It is acted; and from its actual performance before, and reception by, the public, other important changes may and generally are found to be required to adapt it to a practical and living representation. In our own times, the play is sometimes printed immediately on the occasion of its first performance; but in the day of Shakspeare, it lingered in print oftentimes for many years, subject to the caprice or convenience of the theatre, the management, and the actors; and, in the absence of the supervising attention of the author, a multitude of liberties was no doubt taken with the text. As we have described it, this was no doubt the ordeal through which all of the Shakspearian dramas were compelled to pass; and this will amply account for the innumerable various readings, pointings, transpositions, and other mutations with which these dramas have been beset, on all hands, down to our own time; and it will also reconcile us to the belief that 20,000 errors of one kind and another remained to be corrected by this richly-annotated folio. The principal emendations divide themselves into two classes; such as affect the text or language, and those which relate to the action or stage business. Of the first class we have every possible variety, from the slightest corrections in the printing up to the introduction of entire lines. Leaving those of the lesser degree to justify themselves in detail, we direct our attention to the changes in the substance of the text; which, if any, will prove the presence, not of an accidental and fortunate conjectural talent, but of a vital literary faculty, which the instances we shall produce must prove to have issued from the author of the dramas—or not—according to their worth. The most convenient order to pursue is that of the plays themselves. We begin, accordingly, with the "Tempest," and our first example, as brought forward by Mr. Collier, is this:

"The emendation in the subsequent lines, assigned to Prospero, is important. The reading, since the publication of the folio, 1623 (with one exception to be noticed immediately), has invariably been as follows:

The direful spectacle of the wreck, which touch'd
The very virtue of compassion in thee,
I have with such provision in mine art
So safely order'd, that there is no soul—
No, not so much perdition as an hair
Betid to any creature in the vessel.

"The only exception to the above text was a corruption which found its way into the folio, 1632, where 'compassion' of the second line was repeated in the third:

I have with such *compassion* in mine art, &c.

the printer having caught the word from the preceding line.

I have with such *provision* in mine art,

the word in the folio, 1623, has always been followed; but that it was an error may be said to be proved by the manuscript-corrector of the folio, 1632, who altered 'compassion' (as it stood there) not to 'provision' (as it stood in the folio, 1623), but to *pravision*, in reference to Prospero's power of foreseeing what would be the result of the tempest he had raised:

I have with such *prevision* in mine art
So safely ordered, that there is no soul, &c.

"'Provision' would answer the purpose of giving a meaning, because Prospero might have provided that no soul should suffer; but *prevision* supplies a higher and a finer sense, showing that the great magician had by his art foreseen that there should not be 'so much perdition as an hair' among the whole crew. The alteration of a single letter makes the whole difference."

Our next example is from the second play, "The Two Gentlemen of Verona":

"We have here a very important emendation, supplying a whole line, evidently deficient, and yet never missed by any of the commentators. It is in one of the speeches of Sir Eglamour, wherein he consents to aid Silvia in her escape. Until now, it has run:

Madam, I pity much your grievances;
Which since I know they virtuously are plac'd,
I give consent to go along with you.

"Here there is no connection between the first and the second lines, because Sir Eglamour could not mean that the 'grievances,' but that the *affections* of Silvia were virtuously placed.' Shakspeare must, therefore, have written what we find in an adjoining blank space of the folio, 1632, which makes the sense complete:—

Madam, I pity much your grievances,
And the most true affections that you bear;
Which since I know they virtuously are plac'd,
I give consent to go along with you."

Another from the same play:

"The usual opening is in these lines:—

How use doth breed a habit in a man!
This shadowy desert, unfrequented woods,
I better brook than flourishing peopled towns.

"The manuscript-corrector renders the second line—

These shadowy, desert, unfrequented woods, &c.

And another—

"The two lines which close the play are in rhyme, according to the same authority. In the folio, 1623, they do not rhyme, and there stand—

That done, our day of marriage shall be yours;
One feast, one house, one mutual happiness."

"The manuscript-corrector of the folio, 1632, tells us that the lines ought to run as follows:

Our day of marriage shall be yours *no less*—
One feast, one house, one mutual happiness."

From "The Merry Wives of Windsor":

"It occurs at the end of one of the Host's speeches to Dr. Caius:

I will bring thee where Mistress Anne Page is, at a farm-house a feasting, and thou shalt woo her. Cried game, said I well?

"The difficulty has been how to make any sense out of 'Cried game;' and various suggestions, such as *tried game, cry aim*, &c., have been made; but the truth seems to be, that the Host, having said that Anne Page was feasting at a farm-house, in order still more to incite Dr. Caius to go there, mentioned the most ordinary objects of feasting at farm-houses at that time, viz: *curds and cream*: 'curds and cream' in the hands of the old compositor became strangely metamorphosed into *cried game*—at least, this is the marginal explanation in the corrected folio, 1632. The Host, therefore, ends his speech about Anne Page's feasting at the farm-house by the exclamation, 'Curds and cream! said I well?'"

In "Measure for Measure":

"Two rather important words are altered in the corrected folio, 1632, in Claudio's speech. The usual reading is,

She is fast my wife,
Save that we do the denunciation lack
Of outward order: this we came not to,
Only for propagation of a dower.

'Denunciation' is changed to *pronunciation*, and 'propagation' to *procuration*, meaning, of course, the procuring of the dower."

The next emendation of this class—and we have a particular purpose in singling these out—is from "The Comedy of Errors":

"A line is evidently wanting in Dromio's speech, which, but for that omission, and a small word which has dropped out, is entirely in rhyme: the line ending with *steel* has no corresponding verse; but the deficiency, though apparent, has never been remarked upon. In all editions the passage has stood thus:

No, he's in Tartar limbo, worse than hell:
A devil in an everlasting garment hath him,
One whose hard heart is button'd up with steel,
A fiend, a fairy, pitiless and rough;
A wolf, nay, worse, a fellow all in buff.

"It is thus given by the manuscript-corrector of the folio, 1632:

No, he's in Tartar limbo, worse than hell:
A devil in an everlasting garment hath him, *fell;*
One whose hard heart is button'd up with steel,
Who has no touch of mercy, cannot feel;
A fiend, a *fury*, pitiless and rough;
A wolfe, nay, worse, a fellow all in buff," &c.

Of the same class, but of a different species is this, in "Much Ado About Nothing":

"The drollery of Beatrice's description of the difference between 'wooing, wedding, and repenting' is much injured by the omission of a pun just at the conclusion—the first suit (she says) is hot and hasty, like a Scotch jig, and full as fantastical; the wedding, mannerly, modest, as a measure, full of state and ancientry; and then comes repentance, and with his bad legs fall into the cinque pace faster and faster, 'till he sink *a pace* into his grave.' The words in Italics are left out in the printed copy, but are added in manuscript in the margin of the folio, 1632."

And this, which belongs to "Love's Labour's Lost":

"Costard speaks a soliloquy in rhyme at the close of this scene, one line in which is wanting, as is evident from the corresponding line, and from the insertion of the addition, though in a wrong place, by the corrector of the folio, 1632. He perhaps intended to write it in the blank space nearest to where it ought to come in, but he has written it in another blank space above it, and has drawn a mark with his pen to the spot where it is wanted. The whole passage is this, and the line in manuscript we have printed in italics:

Armado 'o the one side—O, a most dainty man!
To see him walk before a lady, and to bear her fan!
To see him kiss his hand! and how most sweetly a' will swear!
Looking babies in her eyes his passion to declare;
And his page o' t' other side, that handful of *small* wit!
Ah heavens, it is most pathetical nit!

Besides the entire line, which escaped the printer or the copyist of the drama, the word *small* was also left out."

And of somewhat different quality, but of the same general class, this, from "A Midsummer Night's Dream:"

"The Fairy, soon after meeting Puck, says, speaking of Titania,

The cowslips tall her pensioners be:
In their gold coats spots you see;
These be rubies, fairy favours,
In those freckles live their savours.

There seem several objections to this passage as it has stood in all editions. First, cowslips are never 'tall,' and, next, the crimson spots are not in their 'coats,' or on their petals, but at the bottom of the calix, as Shakspeare has himself told us, in 'Cymbeline,' Act ii. Scene 2:

Like the crimson drops
I' th' bottom of a cowslip.

The alteration, authorized in manuscript in the folio, 1632, is, therefore, as follows:

The cowslips *all* her pensioners be:
In their gold *cups* spots you see;
Those be rubies, fairy favours,
In those freckles live their savours.

Rubies would be singular decorations for a 'coat,' but were common ornaments to golden chalices."

In the same play:

"Hermia, imagining that Demetrius has killed Lysander, vents her rage upon him in a speech of some length and great violence; upon whch, as the passage has hitherto been given, Demetrius coolly remarks—

You spend your passion on a mispris'd mood;
I am not guilty of Lysander's blood;

but the corrector of the folio, 1632, says that we ought to read—

You spend your passion *in* a mispris'd *flood*:

that is, in a mistaken current, which appears to give additional force and greater intelligibility."

One more from the same:

"In part of Thisbe's dying rhapsody, as it appeared before Theobald's time, he saw that the rhymes did not correspond, as they ought:

These lily lips,
This cherry nose,
These yellow cowslip cheeks, &c.

He therefore proposed *brows* instead of 'lips;' but he missed the alteration of the right word: the manuscript-corrector of the folio, 1632, gives it, and, no doubt, accurately—

'This lily *lip*,
This cherry *tip*,

in allusion to the *tip* of the nose of Pyramus, to which, we may imagine, Thisbe pointed at the moment."

"The Merchant of Venice" furnishes the next:

"There is a material emendation in the speech of the Prince of Arragon, when commenting on the caskets. The reading has always been—

What many men desire: that many may be meant,
By the fool multitude, that choose by show,
Not learning more than the fond eye doth teach;
Which pries not to th' interior, but, like the martlet,
Builds in the weather, &c.

This is certainly intelligible, but the verse is redundant in the first line by 'many' which is erased, and the corrector of the folio, 1632, farther informs us that the words of the poet, in the fourth line, were—

Which *prize* not th' interior, but, like the martlet,
Builds in the weather, &c.

That is to say, the fool multitude do not prize, or value the interior, but judge only by externals. It will be observed also that this new reading restores, in some degree, the regularity of the verse."

And, at no great interval from this, in the same play, this:

"The expression 'to peize the time,' in Portia's introduction of Bassanio to the caskets, has not been well understood: to 'peize' is to weigh, to poise; but the sense wanted is to delay, and that sense we have in the corrector's manuscript, who writes *pause* for 'peize,' in the following extract:

I speak too long: but 'tis to *pause* the time,
To eke it, and to draw it out at length,
To stay you from election.

"Portia wished to postpone Bassanio's choice, lest he should select the wrong casket, and thus necessarily and suddenly terminate their intercourse."

So far, for the present. In another paper we shall continue this important Case.—*Ibid*

* Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakspeare's Plays, from the early manuscript corrections in a copy of the folio of 1632, in the possession of John Payne Collier, F.S.A. 1 vol. 12mo., cloth, with fac-simile of the corrections. J. S. Redfield.

THE LAST POET.

FROM ANASTASIUS GRUEN.

[*The Count Von Auersperg.*]

"'When will you bards be weary
Of rhyming on? How long
Ere it is sung and ended,
The old eternal song?

"'Is it not, long since, empty—
The horn of full supply;
And all the posies gathered
And all the fountains dry?'

"As long as the Sun's Chariot
Yet keeps its azure track,
And but one human visage
Gives answering glances back;

"As long as skies shall nourish
The thunderbolt and gale,
And frightened at their fury
One throbbing heart shall quail;

"As long as after tempest,
Shall spring one showery bow,
One breast with peaceful promise
Of reconcilement glow;

"As long as night the concave
Sows with its starry seed,
And but one man those letters
Of golden writ can read;

"Long as a moonbeam glimmers,
Or bosom sighs a vow,
Long as the wood-leaves rustle
To cool a weary brow;

"As long as roses blossom,
And earth is green in May;
As long as eyes shall sparkle
And smile in pleasure's ray;

"As long as cypress shadows
The graves more mournful make,
Or one cheek's wet with weeping,
Or one poor heart can break;

"So long on earth shall wander
The goddess Poesy,
And with her one exulting
Her votarist to be.

"And singing on, triumphing,
The old earth-mansion through,
Out marches the last minstrel—
He is the last man too.

"The Lord holds the Creation
Forth in his hand, meanwhile,
Like a fresh flower just opened,
And views it with a smile.

"When once this Flower-Giant
Begins to show decay,
And Earths and Suns are flying
Like blossom-dust away;

"Then ask—if of the question
Not weary yet—how long
Ere it is sung and ended
The old eternal song. N. L. FROTHINGHAM."

—*From Gems of German Verse. Edited by W. H. Furness.*

THE COPYRIGHT QUESTION.

The time has at length arrived when the legitimate rights of authors who use the English language in the composition of their works are about to be recognised on either side of the Atlantic. The solution of this question did not involve any great difficulty in theory or in detail; it simply required a little exertion of common policy, common sense, and, above all, common honesty. We have never urged the matter with any great affectation of zeal, not because we did not sympathize with the victims of the fraud, but because we were profoundly convinced of the inutility of remonstrance. We were well aware that a time must come, and it has come at last, when men of letters in the United States would feel the wholesale system of literary piracy tell against themselves with terrible effect. The statement may be permitted without involving any disparagement of those illustrious names which already adorn the literary Pantheon of the United States, but it was scarcely possible for American authors, when placed under commercial disadvantage, to carry on a successful contest against their English cotemporaries. Why should travellers on the railroads of the United States pay two dollars for the productions even of Prescott, Bancroft, Bryant, or Washington Irving, when they could purchase for half or a quarter of the sum the works of Grote, Macaulay, Byron, or Dickens? All that an American publisher required for his stock in trade consisted of a few reams of dirty paper, a few forms of bad type, and consummate disregard of the rights of authors. His MS. came to hand without the delays or annoyances of negotiation—without the expenditure of a single cent. We are, of course, fully aware of all the shifts to which authors and owners of copy-right have had recourse for the protection of their property—but all was in vain. So long as the New York publishers choose to persist in their evil courses—in other words, so long as their acts received countenance from the Government and population of the States, it was impossible for English authors or their assignees to stem the stream. The arguments in favour of the piratical act were just such as would find favour with the rough go-ahead population of a new country. In the first place, there was the feeling of spoiling the Amalekites, and of driving a sharp bargain, which was something. Then the question might be asked, why should they pay at the rate of one shilling a-number for one of Mr. Dickens' monthly numbers, when one of their own publishers would serve them up a dirty reprint of the same matter at about one quarter of the cost? How was the English author hurt because the American reader was benefitted? Why take science and literature out of the ordinary categories of commerce? Poetry and breadstuffs, astronomy and molasses, are, after all, much the same thing in the eyes of a commercial man. Or, even granting that English authors might, in some degree, not exactly be injured, but might not receive the same full measure of benefit as though they had enjoyed the run of the American markets—what then? The English might surely make reprisals on the literature of the United States, and so matters would get straight in the long run. Throughout the long and frequent discussions that have taken place upon this subject, we cannot call to mind that the disputants on the side of the Union have ever used arguments more pertinent than those mentioned above. They did not foresee that a time might come when the case would not simply be as though a Highland gentleman should filch his neighbour's trousers, and complacently invite him to reprisal. It has now assumed other proportions. The poor man is setting up as a gentleman himself, and finds himself brought into competition with the possessor of inherited fortunes, who meet him at every turn upon his own ground, without any necessity for paying tax or quit-rent, or any other of the fiscal burdens against which he is called upon to contend.

This, in point of fact, has been the result of what cannot be considered in any other light than as an act of great national dishonesty. The works of American authors have been smothered under the works of English authors in the American markets. The first could fix a price upon their productions—the second were as castaways upon the seaboard of the United States. Their property was in the hands of the "wreckers." They were without remedy or redress. But, not only did this wholesale system of piracy most injuriously affect the interests of living American authors, but it had a tendency to dwarf down the original literature of the United States to the most servile copyism, and to check the development of the national mind. If citizens of the great republic made up their minds to grow corn and smuggle science—to export cotton and import literature—why, they must abide by the consequences of their own act. Growers of corn and exporters of cotton they must remain to the end of the chapter. No doubt they would drive a more thriving trade in the enumerated articles the more completely they rivetted their attention to the production of raw produce alone; but, if it was their wish to rise in the scale of nations—to rise as nations have risen which have given birth to great philosophers, and poets, and historians—then every [illegible] which could encourage original thought and original taste—taste pure and racy of the soil—was worthy of their serious attention. Certainly the act of overlaying American genius by English was not a very wise measure in this direction. American Literature has already paid a heavy penalty for this act of intellectual cowardice, not to say of moral turpitude. Take the essayists, and poets, and novelists of the United States—powerful and exquisite as many of their compositions undoubtedly are—and see if their thought and diction do not run in English mould. We find in them, no doubt, many allusions to freedom, to the glory of their future, and so forth, which are the natural consequence of the extraordinary history and position of their country; but we do not find originality of thought, as we find it in the literature of Germany, or France, or Italy, as compared with our own. Nor can we for a moment permit it to be said that no such originality is to be looked for, because American authors use the same language, study the same models, and are of a common descent. We reply, English literature at the Elizabethan era is one thing—English literature in the reign of Anne quite another. In the beginning of the present century, and thoughout the Regency, the literary productions of the period differ widely in sentiment and opinion from those of the present day. Now, we have a right to expect that an author who is brought up the citizen of a Republic should write in a different tone from the subject of a mixed monarchy; and that a New York novelist should regard the world in a different point of view from his London contemporary. Illustrious, we repeat it, as are the names of the American authors which we have already cited, we tell them that they have not thrown off English swaddling-clothes. As English authors they might occupy a distinguished place in English literature, but they have not yet made proof of nationality. When that one work lately reached us, which smacked so strongly of American feeling and opinion, how it ran through Europe like wildfire! With the merit of the social views set forth therein we have nothing to do—we regard it simply as a literary production; and as such, despite what we must consider its countless defects in execution and taste, the book succeeded in Europe as no other book from the United States has yet succeeded, mainly because it bore the original stamp of the American mind.

Well, then, there is to be a treaty at last upon this subject, by which English and American authors are to enjoy equal privileges of copyright, respectively, in England and in the United States. It will be a bright spot in the history of the late Daniel Webster that his biographer will have to record that nearly his last act before the illness, which terminated fatally, was the execution of that treaty. He and Mr. Crampton signed for their respective Governments. The treaty was transmitted to England for approval, which it received as a matter of course, and has now been sent back to America, where it formally remains once more under the consideration of Mr. Everett and Mr. Crampton. In point of fact, it does but wait the ratification of the Senate, the body which, in America, is constitutionally charged with the duty of final sanction in such matters. We look forward with the greatest satisfaction to the moment when the treaty will become law, not only because the measure will act most beneficially on the interests of English authors—for it is no light matter to enlarge their public by a population of 25,000,000, which contains quite the English average of readers—but because we are unfeignedly of opinion that the cause of literature and science—in other words, the cause of intellectual progress in the United States—will derive the greatest advantage from this tardy act of justice. We doubt not that as brilliant and glorious a destiny awaits the United States in these respects as in all others. Let American authors feel assured that we shall be the first to glory in their success.—*The (London) Times, March 28.*

MRS. BEECHER STOWE IN ENGLAND.

Many people will observe with regret that Mrs. Stowe's stay in this country will be very short. The crowds that awaited her at every station on her journey from Liverpool to Glasgow show how great is the desire to obtain a mere sight of her. This is natural enough; but we had hoped that when the staring was over, and the first eagerness of welcome past, we should be able to obtain, in peace and quiet, from one who knows so much, some information which may be useful for practical guidance. The occasion of a service like hers is too great and too serious to be disposed of with compliments and empty enthusiasm on the one hand, and recrimination and vituperation on the other. A book written for the relief of an oppressed heart, and going out to stir the hearts of whole nations, is no theme for flattery, or occasion for such spiritual pastime as the most ordinary of our May meeting are expected to yield; and it is worse still to fall into taunting and bickering about national faults and misfortunes. Having got Mrs. Stowe among us, we hoped to keep her and her husband long enough to learn a great deal from them of what must be under the surface, and all round about the subject-matter of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." But they say they must make haste home, and be hard at work again in the United States by the 1st of June. This is an instance of American rapidity which we would gladly have spared; but we must be all the more diligent to learn what we can during the month of their stay, which will afford, no doubt, a series of public adresses, more or less like that of Glasgow.

From this first address we derive one fact, which it is of the highest importance that we should consider. Professor Stowe agrees with all other authorities in saying that sugar and rice would not support American Slavery; and that if it depended on those products, it would die in a year. No British traveller in the United States can have any doubt of this. He could almost count the estates on the low-lying lands which grow rice; and he observes that, cruel as is the aspect of Slavery in the sugar-growing districts, they are narrowly circumscribed; so that the United States have to import sugar largely for their own consumption. And tobacco is no great grievance. Besides that the toil is light, in comparison with that of sugar and cotton growing, the consumption of tobacco, vast as it is, can never support slaves by millions. It is the cotton that is the vantage ground of Slavery. So Professor Stowe tells us; and so we have often been told before; and we always like to hear it, because we think, if this be true, that we see a way out of the evil. Professor Stowe was reminded of cotton from the hour when he landed in Liverpool to that in which he addressed the citizens of Glasgow. "In this country," said he, "is the great market for American cotton; and it is cotton which sustains American Slavery. I do not say you can do without it. I wish I could do without it myself. I have a large family to clothe; I am a poor man myself; and I must use cotton; but I wish I could do without it. But the thing is, can we live without supporting American Slavery?"

That is a question to which thousands now feel no hesitation in answering—yes, we can live without supporting American Slavery, and without depriving ourselves of cotton either. If that were the alternative, we should not now say a word; because we certainly could not wish to deprive millions of our people of the healthful, cheap and convenient clothing that our cotton manufacture affords, or the millions of the maintenance they derive from our manufacture and commerce in that article. In short, it would be nonsense to think of it, and mere cant to talk of it, as the American planters and British manufacturers know perfectly well. But we know something else which may be less familiar to Professor Stowe than to his Anti-Slavery friends in this country—that cotton may be had, whenever we exert ourselves properly to get it, from many other parts of the world than the United States. When we began seriously to see what was doing in India in the way of cotton growing, the Carolina planters grew uneasy; but when they saw what the difficulties were of bringing the produce down the ghats, how many bullocks were lost, and how many bales were spoiled by mud and dust, they laughed. But the effect of railroads in India has yet to be tried, together with that of a good many more ameliorations which we may hope for, from our strengthening determination to obtain better government for India. Then there is Australia. Before the gold was discovered, there seemed some reason to believe that our Australian colonies might become a chief cotton field of Great Britain; and we do not see that the discovery of the gold need spoil the prospect altogether, though it may cause some delay in the realisation. If labourers flock into Australia in sufficient numbers, we may have bulk of Australian cotton yet. One of the oldest cotton brokers in Liverpool, since dead—a man who had grown cotton himself in the United States in his early days—declared, in 1848, after examining divers specimens of Australian cotton, that that product would make a great country hereafter of that distant dependency of ours. So lately as last summer, Mr. Bazley, the President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, declared "his opinion that such superior and excellent attributes of perfect cotton have been rarely seen in Manchester; and that the samples offered indisputably prove the capability of Australia to produce most useful and beautiful cotton, adapted to the English markets." Then, again, there are the West Indies. In Jamaica, specimens of very fine cotton are seen, in the midst of the desolation and dreary waste of that island, where there are millions of acres of fertile land, of which only half a million have ever been appropriated, and where there is no regular traffic, or means of conveying by land or water, except fifteen miles of railroad. There may be a fine commerce in sugar between Jamaica and this country yet, after all that is come and gone, and we hope there will be; but that there will still be hundreds of thousands of acres to spare for cotton; and cotton is a product which it may suit the convenience of the coloured people extremely well to give their attention to when they increase in numbers. This is proved by the success of whatever experiments have been made in Africa; and experiments have been tried there of a very important kind. As long as it was merely a suggestion of the Missionaries, in their eagerness to divert the natives from slave trading, and to furnish them with resources which might raise their condition, men of business might be excused from attending seriously to proposals of a cotton trade. They might be expected to smile and shake their heads, and say that a vast deal depends on the ginning, packing, &c., of cotton, if the soil and the plants were ever so good. But Manchester itself now avows that great results may be anticipated from the humble efforts of the missionaries and their friends. The quality of the samples sent home would be excellent if the cleaning were well managed; and the increase of the quantity grown is so encouraging, that the cleaning is to be well managed. Machinery and men are sent out, not merely to instruct the natives, but to conduct the business, which has become by far too great for the strength and time of the missionaries. A stronger evidence even than this is the presence of those vigilant and ubiquitous nurses of commerce, the Americans, in the central parts of Africa, soliciting the cotton growth, as if they had none at home. They are present at all commercial births; and they have an instinct which leads them to the right spot in the nick of time; and their alighting in the centre of Africa, stimulating the production of cotton, shows that the season for the production of African cotton has come. Silently, stealthily, they have gone up the great rivers from the west; and there, in the heart of the continent, are they lighted upon by travellers from the north. As we derive one kind of lesson from encountering a Russian fort in all the outskirts of the world, so we may derive another kind of lesson from stumbling upon an American factory, virtual or visible in all the centres of the inhabited world; and if we find our cousins fingering cotton, we may take the hint, and may, at an early day, cease to be dependent upon them for the staple of our chief manufacture. There are many inducements to an independence, which we have not yet contemplated with a sufficient seriousness. It is not for our dignity, it is not for our safety, it is not for our moral welfare, to be absolutely dependent on any one country, in any one respect, for a supply of a necessary of life, when that necessary may be had from so many different places. It is not pleasant to know that the old Liverpool broker avowed that he dared not say publicly what he thought of Australian cotton, lest he should lose all his American business. It is not pleasant to hear from Professor Stowe that the price of a slave, who was formerly worth $400, has risen, through our demand for cotton, to £300. It is not pleasant to think that the moral sense and judgment of any portion of our countrymen are under coercion by commercial interests. The one pleasant thing about the whole affair is the certainty that, if cotton be all, we can get out of the difficulty. We can penetrate Western Africa for geographical purposes; we can ascend the Nile for antiquarian recreation; we can go to India to make war, and to Australia for gold, and to China for tea and silk, and to the Pacific Islands to Christianize the people—therefore we can go to these same places for cotton, whenever we so will. And we shall *will it* when we see fully, clearly, and universally, that this is the one way in which, without offence or mischief, we can bear our share in the extinction of remaining negro Slavery, and save our national peace and commercial independence from a certain degree of peril.—*The (London) Daily News.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

"Goodell's *American Slave Code*" has been republished in England.

—— The *Beggar's Petition* (Pity the sorrows, etc.) was written by the Rev. T. Moss, minister of Brierly-hill and Trentham, Staffordshire, England.

—— A hundred mill-girls, selected by an American speculator in Glasgow, have sailed from the Clyde, to commence a new cotton mill at New York.

—— The portrait of Shakspeare, attributed to Cornelius Jansens, is to be engraved. Its authenticity is acknowledged.

—— Lady Anne Barnard, author of the ballad of *Auld Robin Gray*, kept the secret of her authorship for fifty years, when she acknowledged it in a letter to Sir Walter Scott.

—— M. Lenoir, the founder of the French museum, relates that during the transport of the remains of Abelard and Heloise to the Petits Augustins, an Englishman offered him £4000 for one of the teeth of Heloise!

—— Religious Liberty in Norway.—The Norwegian Government (a London paper says), have agreed that the Mormons are not Dissenters, and shall, consequently, not be tolerated in any public act of worship or instruction in the Norwegian kingdom, or be allowed to make oath before any Court.

—— Another Miracle.—The *Official Journal of the Two Sicilies* announces a miracle said to have taken place at Bari, where one of the thorns belonging to the crown with which our Saviour was tortured let fall some drops of blood on Good Friday last, in the presence of a numerous concourse of people. A similar miracle is stated to have taken place at Andria on the same day with another thorn of the crown; and it is added that this is not the first time such a thing has occurred, but that it has been several times observed, the last being in 1842.

—— "General Pierce's Creed.—At the end of a speech, replete with bombast, delivered by General Pierce, at Washington, on his Inauguration as President of the United States, and indicative of his intended policy in that capacity, the General made the following profession of his faith as touching Slavery:

"To every theory of society or government, whether the offspring of feverish ambition or of morbid enthusiasm, calculated to dissolve the bonds of affection and law which unite us, I shall interpose a stern and ready resistance. I believe that involuntary servitude, as it exists in different States of this confederacy, is recognized by the Constitution. I believe that it stands like any other admitted right, and that the States wherein it exists are entitled to efficient remedies to enforce the constitutional provisions. I hold that the laws of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures, are strictly constitutional, and to be unhesitatingly carried into effect. I believe that the constitutional authorities of this republic are bound to regard the rights of the South in this respect, as they would regard any other legal and constitutional right, and that the laws to enforce them should be respected and obeyed, not with a reluctance encouraged by abstract opinions as to their propriety in a different state of society, but cheerfully, and according to the decisions of the tribunal to which their exposition belongs."

So far, however, General Pierce's creed has at least the merit of consistency. In this 'connexion' as himself would say, it contains no objectionable phrase, except 'involuntary servitude.' That is mealy-mouthed. Why not have said at once 'Negro Slavery?' Surely General Pierce was not ashamed of the name—he is not ashamed of the thing. And he should have boldly said so, and carried his belief out. It lacks, to complete it, a few additional clauses—as, 'I believe might is right; I believe that negroes are property alike with cattle. I believe we are at liberty to flog slaves at pleasure. I believe that there are no ties of relationship between coloured persons which we ought to regard. I believe that there is no cause or just impediment why we should not, if we so choose, traffic in human flesh—if black. I believe that we are not forbidden by any law, either of justice or humanity, from separating black child from parent, black husband from wife. I believe that there is no such thing as duty towards a black neighbour. I believe in the supremacy of popular feeling in the United States. I believe in a duty to that. I don't believe in a duty to any other power.'

Instead of which fearless exposition of his tenets, General Pierce proceeded to preach the following sermonet:

"But let not the foundation of our hopes rest upon man's wisdom. It will not be sufficient that sectional prejudices find no place in the public deliberations. It will not be sufficient that the rash counsels of human passion are rejected. It must be felt that there is no national security but in the nation's humble, acknowledged dependence upon God and his overruling providence."

Examine this, for goodness' sake. By 'sectional prejudices,' Pierce means Abolitionism—he uses the word in that 'connexion.' Then, in brief, his precious exhortation amounts to this: 'It is not enough that we must not talk about abolishing Slavery; we must also trust in Providence.'

Did drunkenness—did madness ever utter aught more awfully absurd than this impious snuffle?

The sequel to the creed of General Pierce should consistently, have been—'Hit the nigger hard; he has no friends on earth; and there is no friend to help him elsewhere!'"—*Punch.*

DEFECTIVE ORIGINAL COPY